B 1,597,361

Digitized by Google

Original from
UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

1817
ARTES VERITAS SCIENTIA
LIBRARY OF THE
UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN
E PLURIBUS UNUM
TUEBOR
SI QUÆRIS PENINSULAM AMŒNAM
CIRCUMSPICE
BEQUEST OF
PROF. MAX WINKLER

Digitized by Google
Original from
UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

Digitized by Google
Original from
UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

Digitized by Google
Original from
UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

Digitized by Google
Original from
UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES

EDITED BY

JAMES WILSON BRIGHT, EDITOR-IN-CHIEF

GUSTAV GRUENBAUM WILLIAM KURRELMEYER

H. CARRINGTON LANCASTER

VOLUME XXXIX

1924

THE JOHNS HOPKINS PRESS

BALTIMORE

Digitized by Google

Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

805
M69
L3r
1924
V. 39

Digitized by Google
Original from
UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

Volume XXXIX JANUARY, 1924 Number 1

MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES

EDITED BY

JAMES WILSON BRIGHT, Editor-in-Chief

GUSTAV GRUENBAUM WILLIAM KURRELMEYER

H. CARRINGTON LANCASTER

CONTENTS

VAN ROOSBROECK, G. L.—Notes on Voltaire, - - - - - - - 1
SILZ, W.—Freytag's 'Soll und Haben' and Raabe's 'Der Hungerpastor,' - 10
WHITE, N. I.—The Shelley Society Again, - - - - - - - 18
RATCHFORD, FANNIE E.—The First Draft of Swinburne's 'Hertha,' - 22
BEMENT, N. S.—Balzac's Rate of Production, - - - - - - 26
DALE, G. I.—An Unpublished Version of the 'Historia de Abindarráez y Jarifa,' - - - - - - - - - - - - - 31
KELSO, RUTH.—Saviolo and his 'Practise,' - - - - - - - 33

Reviews:—
William A. Nitze and E. Preston Dargan, A History of French Literature. [*C. Gauss.*] - - - - - - - - - - 35
John S. Smart, The Sonnets of John Milton. [*E. P. Kuhl.*] - - - 45
Otto Behaghel, *Heliand und Genesis.* [*E. H. Sehrt.*] - - - - 50
André Beaunier, Joseph Joubert, Lettres à Mme de Vintimille. [*H. E. Smith.*] - - - - - - - - - - - - - 53

Correspondence:—
Shackford, Martha H., Shakespeare and Greene's *Orlando Furioso,* - 54
Kurtz, B. P., The Prose of Occleve's *Lerne to Dye,* - - - - 56
Lehman, B. H., A Paragraph Deleted by Coleridge, - - - - 58

Brief Mention:—
Arthur Beatty, William Wordsworth, his Doctrine and Art in their Historical Relations, - - - - - - - - - - - 59

THE JOHNS HOPKINS PRESS
BALTIMORE

Eight Numbers a Year — Single Copy (Current) Sixty-five Cents

Entered as Second-Class Matter at the Baltimore, Maryland, Postoffice

Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103, Act of October 3, 1917. Authorized on July 3, 1918

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES

A MONTHLY PUBLICATION with intermission from July to October (inclusive)

This publication is devoted to linguistic and literary research and æsthetic and philosophic criticism in the domain of English, German, a the related Germanic Languages; and of French, Italian, Spanish, and other Languages of the Romance Group. Its purpose is also to prom sound methods in the teaching of the Modern Languages and Literatur

The Subscription Price of the current annual volume is $5.00 for the United States and Mexico; Canada $5.25 and $5.50 for other countries included in the Postal Union.

Contributors and Publishers will please address matter for the English Departm of the *Notes* to James W. Bright; for the German Department to William Kurrelmey for the French Department to H. Carrington Lancaster; for the Italian and Span Departments to Gustav Gruenbaum. Other matter may be sent to the Editor-in-Ch The address of all the editors is Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md.

Subscriptions and other business communications should be sent to the Johns Hopk Press, Baltimore, Md.

PREPARATION OF COPY

All copy should be in typewritten form.

Underscore (for italics) all titles of books, periodicals, poems, plays and ot separately published compositions.

Use numerals in designating foot-notes, and number foot-notes in unbroken sequen

Use roman numerals for volume-reference, set off by a comma before a following pa reference.

Two New Volumes in the Oxford French Series by American Scholars

FRENCH FAIRY PLAYS

BY MATHURIN DONDO, PH. D. and M. ELIZABETH PERLEY, A. M.

These little plays are intended mainly as an aid to the mastery of spoken French in elementary classes. They can be easily performed, not alone by a select group of pupils, but by everyone participating in the class work.

A TRAVERS LA FRANCE

CHOIX DE TEXTES ET D'ILLUSTRATIONS PRÉCÉDÉ DU JOURNAL DE VOYAGE D'UN ÉTUDIANT AMÉRICAIN PAR

FÉLIX BERTAUX, PH. D. ET HÉLÈNE HARVITT, PH. D.

avec la collaboration de RAYMOND WEEKS, PH. D.

This charming and interesting new French text, both in point of scholarship and mechanical features, is arranged in two parts. Part one represents the Diary of an American student from the time he leaves New York. This part furnishes a vivid picture of French life, customs and institutions, with a clear insight into Modern French art and literary movements. Part two provides an anthology of modern and contemporary French literature closely connected with part one by means of cross references. Part two may be used as a guide to contemporary French literature.

OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS

American Branch

35 WEST 32ND STREET, NEW YORK

Digitized by Google

Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PAGE

Van Roosbroeck, G. L., Notes on Voltaire 1
Silz, W., Freytag's *Soll und Haben* and Raabe's *Der Hungerpastor* .. 10
White, N. I., The Shelley Society Again 18
Ratchford, Fannie E., The First Draft of Swinburne's *Hertha* 22
Bement, N. S., Balzac's Rate of Production 26
Dale, G. I., An Unpublished Version of the *Historia de Abindarráez y Jarifa* 31
Kelso, Ruth, Saviolo and his *Practise* 33
Hastings, W. S., An unpublished Correspondence of Honoré de Balzac, 65
Cook, A. S., *Beowulf* 1422 77
Beatty, J. M., Jr., Doctor Johnson and 'Mur' 82
Knowlton, E. C., Genius as an Allegorical Figure 89
Storer, W. H., Notes on Cyrano de Bergerac: A Mythical Translation of the *Histoire Comique . . . de la Lune* 96
Carter, A. L., Nietzsche on the Art of Writing 98
Clark, H. H., A Study of Melancholy in Edward Young, Part I 129
Kaye, F. B., Mandeville on the Origin of Language 136
Martin, H. M., Lope de Vega's *El Vellocino de Oro* in relation to its Sources 142
Pierce, F. E., Blake and Seventeenth Century Authors 150
Tilley, M. P., Good Drink makes Good Blood 153
Krappe, A. H., A Byzantine Source of Shakespeare's *Othello* 156
Belden, H. M., *The Jew's Daughter* and the Myth of Zagreus 161
Clark, H. H., A Study of Melancholy in Edward Young, Part II 193
Flom, G. T., Place-Name Tests of Racial Mixture in Northern England, ... 203
Braune, W., Die Neudrucke Deutscher Literaturwerke 212
Nitze, W. A., The Sources of the Ninth Sonnet of *Les Regrets* 216
Martin, R. G., The Sources of Heywood's *If You Know Not Me, You Know Nobody*, Part I 220
Malone, K., King Aun in the Rök Inscription 223
Mabbott, T. O., A New Poem by Thomas Chatterton 226
Wells, W. H., Chaucer as a Literary Critic 255
Fichter, W. L., Notes on the Chronology of Lope de Vega's *Comedias*, 268
Brooks, N. C., Notes on Performances of French Mystery Plays 276
Fess, G. M., Meléndez Valdés' *Vanidad de las Quejas del Hombre contra su Hacedor* and the *Pensées* of Pascal 282
Greene, G. S., A new Date for George Wilkins's *Three Miseries of Barbary* 285
Loomis, R. S., Bleheris and the Tristram Story 319
Stenberg, T. T., Ibsen's *Catilina* and Goethe's *Iphigenie auf Tauris* .. 329
Potter, G. R., Thomas Chatterton's *Epistle to the Reverend Mr. Catcott* 336

Digitized by Google

Original from
UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

PAG[E]

Austin, H. D., Dante Notes, IV.......... 338
Crawford, A. W., The Apparitions in *Macbeth*.......... 345
Crawford, A. W., The Apparitions in *Macbeth*, Part II.......... 383
Hudson, H. H., Grimald's Translations from Beza.......... 388
Lundeberg, O. K., The True Sources of Robert Dodsley's *The King and the Miller of Mansfield*.......... 394
Lindeman, J. M., A Note on Cynewulf.......... 397
Walz, J. A., Fahrwohl! Eine wortgeschichtliche Untersuchung.......... 399
Livingston, C. H., Old French: *Davedet, Davoudet, Davoudel*.......... 410
Worthington, H. S., The Beethoven Symphony in Balzac's *César Birotteau*.......... 414
Baldwin, T. W., Shakespeare's Jester: The Dates of *Much Ado* and *As You Like It*.......... 447
Whitmore, C. E., Mr. Hardy's *Dynasts* as Tragic Drama.......... 455
Zeydel, E. H., Some Sociological Aspects of Literary Criticism.......... 460
Hagen, S. N., ON. *Nornir* 'Fates'.......... 466
Levin, L. M., A Note on *Raoul de Cambrai*.......... 470
Bullock, W. L., The First French Sonnets.......... 475
Watts, G. B., Notes on Voltaire.......... 479

REVIEWS

William A. Nitze and E. Preston Dargan, A History of French Literature. [*C. Gauss.*].......... 35
John S. Smart, The Sonnets of John Milton. [*E. P. Kuhl.*].......... 45
Otto Behaghel, *Heliand und Genesis.* [*E. H. Sehrt.*].......... 50
André Beaunier, Joseph Joubert, Lettres à Mme de Vintimille. [*H. E. Smith.*].......... 53
Kuno Francke, Die Kulturwerte der Deutschen Literatur in Ihrer Geschichtlichen Entwicklung. Zweiter Band. [*A. B. Faust.*].......... 103
Recent French Text Books. [*R. C. Williams.*].......... 106
Olav Skulerud, Telemaalet i Umriss. [*G. T. Flom.*].......... 111
D. C. Cabeen, The African Novels of Louis Bertrand. [*R. P. Bowen.*] 115
P. Boissonnade, Du Nouveau sur la *Chanson de Roland.* [*D. L. Buffum.*].......... 166
C. F. Ward, *Le Livre de la déablerie.* By Eloy D'Amerval. [*Grace Frank.*].......... 173
Paul Friedrich und Fritz Ebers, Das Grabbe-Buch. [*E. H. Zeydel.*] 175
Alice J. DuBreuil, The Novel of Democracy in America. [*C. S. Northup.*].......... 178
Gerhard Moldenhauer, Herzog Naimes im altfranzösischen Epos. [*H. E. Haxo.*].......... 180
Ferdinand Brunot, La Pensée et la Langue. [*A. Schinz.*].......... 229
Lucius L. Hubbard, A Dutch Source for *Robinson Crusoe*.. [*A. H. Nethercot.*].......... 235

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

PAGE

John Beresford, The Poems of Charles Cotton 1630-1697. [*B. G. Clough.*] 241
Chauncey B. Tinker, Nature's Simple Plan. [*R. S. Crane.*] 291
Leopold Lacour, Les premières actrices françaises. [*H. C. Lancaster.*] 297
O. E. Lessing, Geschichte der deutschen Literatur in ihren Grundzügen. [*E. H. Zeydel.*] 301
Pierre de Bacourt and J. W. Cunliffe, French Literature during the Last Half-Century. [*G. Chinard.*] 305
Friedrich Kluge, Etymologisches Wörterbuch der deutschen Sprache. [*W. Kurrelmeyer.*] 350
G. Millardet, Linguistique et Dialectologie romanes. [*C. Gilli.*] 357
Francis A. Litz, Father Tabb: A Study of his Life and Works. [*K. Campbell.*] 361
Albert Schinz, Eighteenth Century Readings. [*G. Chinard.*] 363
Bauwens, J., La Tragédie française et le théâtre hollandais au dix-septième siècle. I. [*H. C. Lancaster.*] 364
Hauptfragen der Romanistik. Festschrift für Ph. A. Becker. [*O. Müller.*] 367
Carleton Brown, Religious Lyrics of the XIVth Century. [*K. Young.*] 419
George O. Curme, A Grammar of the German Language. [*K. Zwierzina.*] 425
Robert Petsch, Goethes *Faust*. [*B. Seuffert.*] 428
Louis Thuasne, Oeuvres de François Villon; Ferdinando Neri, Le Poesie de François Villon. [*U. T. Holmes.*] 430
James Douglas Bruce, The Evolution of Arthurian Romance. [*G. H. Maynadier.*] 482
Ludwig Pfandl, Spanische Literaturgeschichte. [*R. Schevill.*] 487
Walter Silz, Heinrich von Kleist's Conception of the Tragic. [*Kuno Francke.*] 494
Frank Herman Reinsch, Goethe's Political Interests prior to 1787. [*E. H. Zeydel.*] 496
Gilbert Chinard, Volney et l'Amérique. [*G. R. Havens.*] 499

CORRESPONDENCE

Shackford, Martha H., Shakespeare and Greene's *Orlando Furioso* .. 54
Kurtz, B. P., The Prose of Occleve's *Lerne to Dye* 56
Lehman, B. H., A Paragraph Deleted by Coleridge 58
Peck, W. E., Shelley's Reviews Written for the *Examiner* 118
Mustard, W. P., Dante and Statius 120
Walker, A. S., A Sidelight on Shelley 121
Cawley, R. R., "Areytos" in Sidney's *Defence of Poesy* 121
McCutcheon, R. P., Dryden's Prologue to the *Prophetess* 123
Kaufman, P., The Touchstone Method of Judging Poetry 124
Evans, G. F., An Overlooked Sonnet 184

Digitized by Google   Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

PAGE
Woodbridge, B. M., Bel Ami and Madame Walter 185
Morris, Muriel, A Note on Wordsworth and Vaughan 187
Tracy, T. F., A Source of Anatole France: Benvenuto Cellini 188
Taylor, Pauline, Birnam Wood: 700 A. D.—1600 A. D 244
Ibershoff, C. H., Bodmer Indebted to Dante 247
Van Roosbroeck, G. L., Uncollected Poems by Fontenelle 249
Kaye, F. B., La Rochefoucauld and the Character of Zimri 251
Peck, W. E., Keats, Shelley, and Mrs. Radcliffe 251
Parry, J. J., An Arthurian Parallel 307
Bullock, W. L., Some Notes to a Note 309
Campbell, T. M., A Correction 311
Peck, W. E., On the Origin of the Shelley Society (Postscript) 312
Bell, C. H., *Helmbrecht*, 1251 372
Cook, A. S., Chaucer and Venantius Fortunatus 376
Sturtevant, A. M., Old Norse *Sko* 378
Briggs, W. D., First Song in *The Beggar's Bush* 379
Woodbridge, B. M., Sylvestre Bonnard's Fairy Again 380
Ibershoff, C. H., Another French Source of Bodmer 434
Briggs, W. D., On the Meaning of the Word 'Lake' in Marlowe's *Edward II* 437
McKillop, A. D., Some Details of the Sonnet Revival 438
Gillet, J. E., A Forgotten Sonnet of Lope de Vega 440
De Perrott, J., *The Mirror of Knighthood* 441
Blankenagel, J. C., A Wieland Quotation by H. v. Kleist 442
Swedelius, B. F., Is the Spanish *Romance* Always Quatenary? 443
Malone, K., Notes on the *Writing Scholar's Companion* (1695) 502
Van Roosbroeck, G. L., Diderot's Earliest Publication 504
Baldwin, T. W., The Three Francis Beaumonts 505
Goddard, E. R., Bovée's *Première Année de Français*. A Reply 507

BRIEF MENTION

Arthur Beatty, William Wordsworth, his Doctrine and Art in their Historical Relations. [*J. W. Bright.*] 59
Edward D. Snyder, The Celtic Revival in English Literature, 1760-1800. [*J. W. Tupper.*] 125
Frederick A. G. Cowper, Italian Folk Tales and Folk Songs. [*T. F. Crane.*] 126
T. M. Campbell, Hebbel, Ibsen and the Analytic Exposition. [*M. G. Bach.*] 127
Egon Cohn, Gesellschaftsideale und Gesellschaftsroman des 17. Jahrhunderts. [*R. B. Roulston.*] 128
J. Melander, *Guibert d'Adrenas*; Jessie Crosland, *Guibert d'Adrenas*. [*Grace Frank.*] 190
Percy H. Houston, Doctor Johnson, a Study in Eighteenth Century Humanism. [*J. W. Tupper.*] 191

Digitized by Google

Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

PAGE

Norman Foerster and J. M. Steadman, Sentences and Thinking. [*J. C. French.*] 252
Hyder E. Rollins, *A Handful of Pleasant Delights.* [*E. P. Kuhl.*] .. 254
Johannes Bolte, Johannes Pauli's *Schimpf und Ernst.* [*T. F. Crane.*] 314
Gustave Rudler, Les techniques de la critique et de l'histoire littéraires en littérature française moderne. [*H. C. Lancaster.*] 316
H. J. Chaytor, The Troubadours and England. [*Grace Frank.*] 318
Charles H. Haskins, The Rise of Universities. [*E. P. Kuhl.*] 381
Schriften der Kleist-Gesellschaft, Band 2. [*W. Kurrelmeyer.*] 382
Louis Allard, La Comédie de mœurs en France au dix-neuvième siècle; N. C. Arvin, Eugène Scribe and the French Theatre. [*H. C. Lancaster.*] 444
George B. Churchill, *The Country Wife* and *The Plain-Dealer*, by William Wycherley. [*J. W. Tupper.*] 445
Harry Rickel, The Wisdom of Balzac. [*W. S. Hastings.*] 446
Emil Ermatinger, Wieland und die Schweiz. [*W. Kurrelmeyer.*] 508
L. M. Price, Johann Elias Schlegel's *Die stumme Schönheit.* [*B. J. Vos.*] 509
Roland P. Gray, Songs and Ballads of the Maine Lumberjacks. [*E. P. Kuhl.*] 510

Index 511

Recent Publications .... i-xxxiv

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

Digitized by Google
Original from
UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

Grad. 2.
2 11-31

MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES

VOLUME XXXIX JANUARY, 1924 NUMBER 1

NOTES ON VOLTAIRE

I.—*The Date of a Letter by Voltaire.*

It is well known that both the text and the dates of Voltaire's letter in the Moland edition of his *Oeuvres Complètes* are frequently inexact. Another example of their erroneous classification is furnished by letter 418 from Voltaire to M. de Formont, which has been placed among those of the month of June, 1734, although it bears no other date than: "Ce 27 . . . "[1] This letter is important for Voltaire's biography since it contains the earliest mention of *Alzire ou les Américains* and has been cited as a proof that he had begun to compose this play before June, 1734. An examination of the contents of the letter proves, however, that the date assigned to it is erroneous.

At the end of it, Voltaire asks: "Mandez-moi, je vous prie, si vous avez rencontré Moncrif et pourquoi il s'est brouillé avec son prince." This inquiry refers to Moncrif's misfortune in losing his position as secretary to the Prince de Clermont.[2] The reasons for his dismissal have remained mysterious and several *Notices* and articles on him attribute it to different motives, but its date can be easily determined.

[1] Moland, XXXIII, p. 418.

[2] In an article, *A Quarrel of Poets: Voltaire, Moncrif and Roy,* published in the *Philological Quarterly,* I have given more details about Moncrif's dismissal and his quarrel with Roy, about an ode in honor of Voltaire. On Moncrif cf., especially, V. Fournel, *Du rôle des coups de bâton dans les relations sociales et, en particulier dans l'histoire littéraire,* 1858, p. 158; introduction to the *Histoire des Chats* by G. Grappe (*Petite Bibliothèque surannée,* 1909); *Notice* by O. Uzanne in the edition of the *Livre des Chats* (*Conteurs du 18e siècle*); La Place, *Pièces intéressantes et peu connues,* 1781, vol. VIII; *Mémoires d'Argenson;* Grimm, *Correspond. litt.;* J. Bouché, *Gallet et le Caveau,* vol. I, etc.

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

On December 14, 1734, Marais writes to the Président Bouhier: "Il s'est passé bien des choses; la plus nouvelle est que M. le Comte de Clermont a chassé de chez lui M. de Moncrif, secrétaire de ses commandements, lui a défendu de paraître devant lui et de lui faire parler pour en savoir la cause, laquelle, de son côté, M. le Prince ne dira point, en sorte que l'on est à deviner et que l'on devine mal."[3] A few days later, on December 19, he repeats: "La disgrâce de M. de Moncrif, subsiste toujours; c'est une énigme inexplicable."[4] On February 12, 1735, the author of the *Nouvelles de la Cour et de la Ville* still refers to it as to a fairly recent fact. "Vous savez, peut-être, qu'il [the Prince de Clermont] a remercié Moncrif, qui était le secrétaire de ses commandements, qui est bien heureux d'avoir obtenu par sa protection une place à l'Académie française. . . On dit plusieurs raisons de sa disgrâce . . . "[5]

Moreover, another letter of Voltaire—of December, 1734—speaks of de Moncrif's misfortune in terms which betray that he had then just learned what had happened to him: "S'il faut se réjouir avec l'auteur de *l'Histoire Japonaise,* il faut s'affliger avec l'auteur de *Tithon et l'Aurore.* Si je savais où le prendre, je lui écrirais pour lui faire mon compliment de condoléance de n'être plus avec un prince, et pour le féliciter d'avoir retrouvé sa liberté."[6] Now, this letter dates without any doubt from the latter part of December, 1734, for "the author of *l'Histoire Japonaise,*" Crébillon fils, had been arrested on December 8, and released a few days later, so that Voltaire's desire to congratulate him is easily understood.[7] And it must be noticed that the reference in December, 1734 to the recent dismissal of Moncrif, "the author of *Tithon et l'Aurore,*" fits in with the date assigned to it by the letters of Marais, which I just quoted. It is, then, obvious enough that Voltaire's letter, number 418 of the Moland edition, must be classified, not as of June 27, 1734, but as of December 27, 1734. The earliest reference to *Alzire* was, therefore, made on this latter date.

[3] *Archives de la Bastille,* pub. by Fr. Ravaisson, XII, 66.
[4] *Archives de la Bastille,* XII, 68.
[5] Paris, 1879, pub. by A. de Barthélémy, p. 8.
[6] Moland, XXXIII, p. 462.
[7] *Archives de la Bastille,* XII, 165-166.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

II.—*Voltaire or the Abbé Alary?*

In his article *L'Affaire des Lettres Philosophiques de Voltaire,*[8] M. Gustave Lanson has demonstrated that not the Court, but rather the Procureur Général, Joly de Fleury, insisted upon Voltaire's condemnation. This conclusion is apparently contradicted by a passage from a letter of Matthieu Marais to the Président Bouhier, dated August 23, 1734: "Le pharmacopole n'est point exilé; il a su qu'on ne le comprenait pas dans l'instruction du Roi, que l'on prépare; il en a parlé insolemment à M. le Cardinal. On a su encore qu'il se mêlait d'intrigues d'état, et rendait des lettres venant de pays étrangers; ajoutez le bruit qui se répandit après la mort de Mme de Lambert, et vous verrez que la Cour a bien fait de le congédier . . . "[9]

The editor of the *Archives de la Bastille,* M. de Ravaisson, identifies the "pharmacopole," to whom this letter refers, with Voltaire: "Quant au pharmacopole, c'est Voltaire." If this identification was correct, it would be of importance for the history of Voltaire's difficulties with the official world about the time of the *Lettres Philosophiques.* However, the "pharmacopole" is not Voltaire, but the Abbé Pierre Joseph Alary (1689-1770). This nickname had been bestowed upon him because his father was a pharmacist. Roy, in his well known satire against the French Academy, *Le Coche,* indicates him with that name:

> Vous êtes là, petit Pharmacopole;
> Chez votre père aviez pris une fiole
> Qui se cassant vous effleura la peau.
> Mais aviez-vous besoin d'être si beau?[10]

In the margin of the printed text of *Le Coche,* in the *Mémoires pour servir à l'Histoire de la Calotte,* as well as in some manuscripts of it, one reads: *l'Abbé Alary.*

Moreover, he had been a member of the French Academy since 1724 and *Le Coche* dates from 1727, long before Voltaire was

[8] *Revue de Paris,* July 15, 1904.

[9] *Archives de la Bastille,* XII, 161.

[10] *Le Coche* has been printed several times: *Mémoires pour servir à l'Histoire de la Calotte,* 1750, III, 65; Raunié, *Chansonnier historique du 18e Siècle,* V, 127, etc. It is also found in a manuscript by Roy: MS. 2979 of the Bibliothèque de l'Arsenal, and in a MS.: *Recueil de plusieurs Pièces,* in my possession.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

elected to it.[11] The facts to which the letter of Marais refers, are well enough known. The Marquis d'Argenson narrates them in his *Mémoires* under the month of July, 1734. The Abbé Alary had become secretary of the Abbé de Longuerue then *"sous-précepteur du Dauphin."* By intrigue, it is said, he tried to become preceptor of the successor to the throne, but failed and had to leave the court.[12] It is manifestly to these incidents that the letter of Marais refers, and not to Voltaire's difficulties about the *Lettres Philosophiques.*

III.—*On two Sources of 'Zadig.'*

1. The source of *Le Nez* (*Zadig,* Chap. II) is a Chinese version of the story of the widow of Ephesus.[13] W. Seele in his *Voltaire's Roman Zadig ou la Destinée. Eine Quellenforschung,* (1891) points out that the version which Voltaire used appeared in 1735 in Father Duhalde's *Description de la Chine.*[14] There the story is different in its details from the one told in Zadig: Tschuang-Song, a disciple of Lao-Tze, once found on a grave a young woman who tried to dry the earth by fanning it continually. She confides to him that she had made a vow not to marry again before the earth on her husband's grave would be dry. The compassionate Saint moves the fan over the grave, according to the magic rites of Lao-Tze, and dries the earth by miracle. He takes the fan home to his wife, who makes a great show of anger at the story and boasts of her own fidelity. A few weeks later Tschuang-Song dies and, seven days after his death, there arrives a young prince, who tries to console the weeping widow. Soon they resolve upon their marriage. On the day of the ceremony the young husband swoons and his servant states that he can only be cured by the brain, boiled in wine, of a man who has been dead less than forty-nine days. The widow takes an ax, opens her former husband's coffin, and is ready to deprive him of his brain,

[11] Roy was imprisoned at Saint Lazare, in 1727, for having written this satire. See, J. Delort, *Histoire de la détention des Philosophes et des Gens de lettres à la Bastille et à Vincennes,* 1829, II, 125-128.

[12] *Mémoires d'Argenson* (Bibl. Elzév.), I, 67 and 113.

[13] Cf. Ed. Grisebach, *Die Wanderung der Novelle von der treulosen Witwe durch die Weltliteratur,* 2nd edition, Berlin, 1889.

[14] The translation, although published in this work, was not by Father Duhalde, but by Father Dentrecolles.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

when he awakens. The young prince is only his double personality, his shadow which he had objectified by means of magic. His wife hangs herself. The philosopher sings a pessimistic song, burns his house, and goes West, never to marry again.

W. Seele has not noticed that Voltaire's *Sottisier*—a kind of note book for miscellaneous verse and prose—contains a modified version of the story of the Chinese widow. The name of the philosopher, who is here no magician but simply a man of letters, is given as Ouang, instead of Tschuang-Song. The supernatural has entirely disappeared: Ouang does not objectify his "shadow," his "second self," but simply pretends to be dead. The second husband-to-be is a real person, not a phantom. These differences seem important enough to substantiate the belief that Voltaire did not use the translation published in Duhalde's *Description de la Chine,* but some other version of the tale in which the name of the hero and some incidents were modified. Voltaire's *Sottisier* is a memorandum, not destined for publication: he had therefore, no reason for changing the incidents of a story which, at that moment, he did not intend to give to the public. On the other hand, it is possible that Voltaire wrote the story down from memory and changed it unconsciously. If so, the note of the *Sottisier* would be important as an example of the transformation of source material in Voltaire's mind. Here follows, for comparison, the note as he wrote it:

"L'histoire de la Matrone d'Ephèse se trouve dans un vieux livre Chinois. Le lettré Ouang rencontre une jeune femme éplorée au bord de la mer; elle était sur le tombeau de son mari et remuait un grand éventail. "Pourquoi ce travail, Madame?"—"Hélas! mon cher mari m'a fait promettre que je ne me remarierais que quand ce tombeau serait sec, et je l'évente pour le sécher." Ouang raconte cette histoire à sa femme, qui frémit d'horreur et qui lui jure qu'elle ne se servira jamais de l'éventail. Ouang fait une maladie et contrefait le mort; on le met au cercueil. Aussitôt paraît un jeune homme fort joli, qui vient pour étudier chez le lettré, etc. Il plaît, on l'épouse. Il tombe en convulsions; son vieux valet fait accroire à la dame qu'il faut la cervelle d'un mort pour le guérir, et la bonne femme va fendre la tête à son mari Ouang qui sort de son tombeau." [15]

[15] Moland, XXXII, 518.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

2. The *Sottisier* contains also a note by Voltaire, which must be considered as the nucleus of the story *Le Chien et le Cheval.* (*Zadig,* Chap. III) "Des Arabes rencontrèrent un homme qui leur demanda s'ils n'avaient pas vu son chameau. "Il est borgne, lui dit l'un—Il est boiteux, ajouta l'autre.—Il a la queue coupée, dit le troisième.—Il a le goût dépravé, dit le quatrième.—Vous l'avez donc vu? dit le voyageur.—Non, répondirent-ils, nous ne l'avons point vu." Cet homme crut qu'on lui avait volé son chameau, et procès. Les quatre Arabes dirent au juge: "Nous avons remarqué qu'un chameau avait passé par un pré; qu'il n'avait mangé l'herbe que d'un côté, et nous l'avons conclu borgne; qu'il avait moins appuyé d'un pied, et nous l'avons jugé boiteux; que sa fiente était en un tas, et nous l'avons dit sans queue; qu'il n'avait pas mangé la bonne herbe, et nous l'avons jugé malade."[16]

This story, which W. Seele has also overlooked in his study of the sources of *Zadig,* differs a good deal from the one told in *Le Voyage et les Aventures des trois Princes de Sarandip, traduits du Persan par le Chevalier de Mailly* (1719), which is said to have directly inspired Voltaire:[17] When the three travelling princes had arrived in the country of the Emperor Behrama, they met a merchant, who asked them whether they had not perceived his lost camel. The oldest prince said that the camel had only one eye; the second, that it lacked a tooth; the third, that it limped. After a vain search for the lost animal, the owner comes back and the princes give him further information: the camel was loaded on one side with butter, on the other with honey, a woman was sitting on it and she was with child. They are then accused of having stolen the camel and the goods and condemned, but, before their execution, the animal is recovered.

At the demand of the Emperor, the Princes furnish the following explanations: The camel has only one eye, for he ate grass on only one side of the road; he lacks a tooth, since bunches of grass of the breadth of a camel's tooth lay on the road; the imprints showed that he limped. He was loaded with honey, for on

[16] Moland, XXXII, 573.

[17] The *Année Littéraire of* 1767 (I, 145) pointed this volume out as the source of Voltaire's tale. It is a translation from an Italian work: *Peregrinaggio de tre figliuoli del Re di Serendippo per opera di Christoforo Armeno della Persiana nell' Italiana lingua transportato,* Venezia, 1584.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

one side of the road sat many flies on the branches which touched his load; and with butter, for, on the other side of the road a multitude of ants were feasting on some that had dropped. The presence of the woman was betrayed by the disorder of the place where she stopped, and she was with child since imprints in the sand showed that she leaned on her hands to get up again.

The version which Voltaire noted down in his *Sottisier* shows certain differences which seem to indicate that he consulted another form of the story than the one given in *Les Voyages et les Aventures des trois Princes de Sarendip*.[18] He speaks of four Arabs and not of three princes. Voltaire describes the camel as tailless and sick, in contrast with his supposed direct source, of which several details are lacking. The only two points in which Voltaire's note agrees with the details given in the *Trois Princes de Sarendip* are that the camel, in both cases, is limping and one-eyed.

IV.—*Variants of Voltaire's Stances sur les Poètes Epiques.*

A manuscript of about 1734, in my possession, entitled *Recueil de Plusieurs Piesse,* contains (p. 160) some unknown variants of Voltaire's *Stances sur les Poètes Epiques.* The text given in the Moland edition of his works (VIII, p. 505) is very probably revised: Although the poem was written, according to Beuchot, in or before 1731, the sixth strophe—a *dédicace* to the Marquise da Châtelet—dates from 1734. Since the variant version, published here, lacks the sixth strophe of 1734, it represents probably the early form of the poem:

Plein de beautés et de défauts,
Homère *eut toujours* mon estime,
Comme chacun de ses héros
Il est babillard mais sublime.

Virgile orne mieux la raison,
Et plus tendre, a plus d'harmonie,
Mais il s'épuise avec Didon
Et rate à la fin Lavinie.

De faux brillants, trop de magie
Mettent le Tassse *un rang* plus bas;
Mais que *ne pardonne*-t-on pas
Pour Armide et pour Herminie?

[18] The story is quite general, cf. Dunlop, pp. 212, 410, 487.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

Milton plus sublime *que* tous
A des béautés moins agréables;
Et ne chante que pour les fous,
Pour *des* anges où pour *des* diables.

There are no variants in the fifth strophe; the sixth is lacking.

V.—*Additions and Corrections to Voltaire's Bibliography.*

1. *Ode sur les Malheurs du Temps.*—1713.—Bengesco in his *Bibliographie de Voltaire* (No. 538) states that this *Ode* was published for the first time in 1757, in *Le Portefeuille trouvé ou Tablettes d'un Curieux,* (Vol. I, p. 250). This is, however, not the first edition. As early as 1718, the second, sixth, and twelfth strophes were printed in de Boissy's *L'élève de Terpsicore ou le Nourrisson de la Satyre,* among the examples of good verse (vol. II. pp. 11, 86 and 101). The whole poem is found, in 1750, in a short-lived eighteenth century periodical: *Petit Réservoir, contenant une variété de faits historiques et critiques, de littérature, de morale et de Poésies. . . .* La Haye, Jean Néaulme (Vol. III, p. 262). To the title of the *Ode* is added "*attribuée à Mr de Voltaire.*"

2. *Dialogues* (Bengesco, *Bibliographie de Voltaire,* No. 1615-1617)—The three dialogues: *Entre un Plaideur et un Avocat; Entre Mme de Maintenon et Mlle de Lenclos; Entre un philosophe et un contrôleur de Finances,* are said to have been published for the first time in the 8th volume of the 1751 edition of Voltaire's *Works* (pp. 259-274). They are found, the same year, in the periodical *Petit Réservoir,* mentioned above (vol. IV, pp. 3-24). It is difficult to decide which is the first edition.

3. *Le Cocuage.*—Bengesco (*Op. cit.* I, p. 181) gives as the first edition of this poem, the *Poésies diverses de M. de Voltaire,* printed, in 1724, with the Amsterdam edition of *La Ligue ou Henry le Grand* (pp. 178-179). He notes that the poem occurs with the title of *L'Apothéose du Cocuage, Conte allégorique,* in the *Lettres Historiques et Galantes de Mme Dunoyer,* edition of 1790 (vol. VI, p. 312).

But Mme Dunoyer's *Letters* date from the beginning of the eighteenth century, and *Le Cocuage* appears already in the edition of 1718: *Lettres Historiques et galantes de deux dames de condition. . . .* Cologne, Pierre Marteau, 1718 (vol. V, p. 179).

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

This is the earliest edition of Mme Dunoyer's *Letters* which I have been able to consult, but the *Avis du Libraire* makes it clear that it was preceded by an edition in seven volumes, which may contain *Le Cocuage:* "Je ne ferai donc point ici l'apologie de cette nouvelle édition; je me contenterai de dire seulement qu' à la prière de quelques personnes je l' ai réduite en cinq volumes au lieu de sept où elle était dans la première, et l' ai augmentée dans celle-ci de quantité de pièces très curieuses."

4. *Le Bourbier.*—Bengesco (No. 675) mentions that *Le Bourbier* appeared in the *Lettres historiques et galantes,* but he indicates only the edition of 1739 (vol. IV, p. 252). This satire occurs also in the edition of 1718 (vol. V, p. 233) and may be found in the earlier edition referred to above.

5. The Library of the University of Minnesota possesses copies of the following editions of plays by Voltaire, which are not listed in Bengesco's *Bibliographie:*

Zayre, Tragédie par M. de Voltaire, représentée pour la première fois sur le théâtre des Comédiens François ordinaires du Roi, au mois d'Aout, Novembre et Décembre 1742 (sic, for 1732)—A Avignon, chez Louis Chambeau. . . . MDCCLX., in-8. 50 pp. (Cf. Bengesco, No. 59.)

Oreste, tragédie par M. Arouet de Voltaire.—A Paris, Rue Saint Jacques. P. G. Le Mercier et M. Lambert.—1750. 68 pp. in-8.

(Continuous pagination. The *Epître à S. A. S. Madame la Duchesse Du Maine* runs from p. 3 to p. 13. The first edition, described by Bengesco (No. 59) has three preliminary ff., xxi pp. for the *Epître,* 212 pp. for the text of the play and one additional f. for the *Approbation* and the *Privilège,* which are lacking in this edition, which I believe to be the second.)

Saul et David, Tragédie. D'après l'Anglais intitulé, The Man after God's own heart. Imprimé chez Robert Freeman in Pater-Noster-Row. 1760. 43 pp., in-8.

(The edition described by Bengesco, No. 249, has a slightly different title: *Saul et David, Hyperdrame.* He gives no number of pages.)

Olympie, Tragédie nouvelle de M. de Voltaire. Représentée pour

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

la première fois par les comédiens ordinaires de S. A. S. E. Monseigneur l'Electeur Palatin, sur le Théâtre de Schwetzingen, le 30 Septembre et le 7 Octobre de l'année passée.—A Avignon, chez Louis Chambeau.—1763.—52 pp. in-8 (Cf. Bengesco, No. 259).

GUSTAVE L. VAN ROOSBROECK.

University of Minnesota.

FREYTAG'S *SOLL UND HABEN* AND RAABE'S *DER HUNGERPASTOR.*

In the ever-increasing literature dealing with Wilhelm Raabe, especially in that of the productive anniversary years 1901, 1911, and 1921, one finds numerous references to writers, ancient and modern, with whose works Raabe's more or less similar productions are compared, or to whom an influence on Raabe is ascribed. If one jots down these names, one ends with an inclusive and imposing array: Jean Paul, E. T. A. Hoffmann, Salomon Gessner, Arnim, Immermann, Alexis, Schopenhauer, Goethe, Schiller, Heine, Freiligrath, Fontane, Böhme, Wilhelm Busch, Adalbert Stifter, Andersen, Shakespeare, Dickens, Goldsmith, Thackeray, Sterne, Fielding, Smollet, Dumas père, Manzoni, Dante, Homer, Cervantes. In spite of this assiduous activity, however, no one, so far as I am aware, has found any similarity between Gustav Freytag's *Soll und Haben* and Raabe's *Hungerpastor,* nor credited the former with any influence on the latter. That certain of the patent similarities here have not been pointed out is somewhat surprising, in view of the well-established popularity of these two novels, which have become *Hausbücher* in the most genuine sense, and which are found together even on modest German bookshelves. At the time of the *Raabe-Gedenkbuch* of 1921, there had been printed 214,000 copies of *Der Hungerpastor;*[1] the 102nd edition of *Soll und Haben,* printed in 1920, had brought its total up to 374,000 copies.

In general, the subject-matter and scope of the two novels is about the same, and if we accept Karl Ziegner's formulation of Raabe's purpose, we shall have no difficulty in applying it to Frey-

[1] H. M. Schultz, *Raabe-Gedenkbuch für 1921*, p. 149.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

tag's novel also: "Es handelt sich bei Raabe um die Geschichte einer Seele, um die Erziehung des Einzelmenschen zum innerlich durchgebildeten tüchtigen Glied der grossen Menschengesellschaft."[2] Both novels, that is to say, belong to the prolific genus of *Erziehungsromane;* they conduct their hero from birth to early maturity; they depict his *Lehr- und Wanderjahre,* his mistakes, struggles and sufferings, and finally his return to the right woman and the right sphere of activity, where he gains a firm anchorage and a promising prospect for the future.

Both novels may be said to exhibit two kinds of idealism, or rather, idealism as against mere ambition. Freytag states this quite early in his story,[3] and he has pointed to it elsewhere[4] as the "Idee des Ganzen": let a man beware what dreams he nourishes in his heart, for when they are full-grown they will gain the mastery over his life. And Raabe constantly points to the difference between the idealistic "hunger" of Hans Unwirrsch and the ambitious "hunger" of Moses Freudenstein. This central theme necessitates in both novels a marked parallelism and antithesis in the lives of two characters, one representing the true and the other the false idealism.

Anton Wohlfahrt and Hans Unwirrsch are imbued with the true idealism, which leads them upward from humble circumstances to an honorable station in life. The birth of the hero is in both cases the opening event of the story, and it appears very soon that the fathers are of unusual importance in shaping the lives of their sons. Both fathers are characterized by their calling, but in each case they are important for the story not in their calling, but by virtue of the spiritual inheritance which they pass on to their sons, whom they love with great tenderness and the hope for whose future fills and illuminates their own lives.

From the conscientious and careful Kalkulator, Anton inherits the love of orderliness, faithfulness, industry and integrity; it is the father's last act to establish his son in a business which is to determine his whole life, and his own idealizing love for this business casts over it a halo which in Anton's eyes it never loses. The

[2] Karl Ziegner, *Die Psychologische Darstellung und Entwicklung der Hauptcharaktere in Raabes Hungerpastor,* Greifswald (Adler), 1913, p. 16.

[3] *Soll und Haben,* 102. Aufl., Leipzig (Hirzel), 1920, I, p. 9.

[4] *Lebenserinnerungen,* Leipzig (Hirzel), 1887, p. 261.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

heritage of Hans' father, the visionary cobbler-poet, is of a nobler sort, to be sure—as Raabe's whole book surpasses Freytag's in poetic richness—but yet it cannot be said to be of greater influence on the career of his son. Both fathers die early, and cannot see the harvest they have sowed, nor guide the sons in whom they are so strikingly re-incarnated.

Both Anton and Hans are late-born children of devoted parents, somewhat precocious, and of a quiet, meditative disposition; in fact they both escape a reputation for saintliness in early youth only by vigorous use of their fists. Both show an unusual love of books and distinguish themselves as students. They are both natures in whom feeling is more important than will, and their attributes are emotional rather than voluntary or intellectual: quick of sympathy, affectionate, home-loving, loyal, helpful, generous, patient to a fault, they become aggressive almost always because of an unselfish feeling or impulse. Both, for instance, incur the displeasure of the higher classes because of their avowed sympathy for the lower. Their self-assertion is thus primarily an expression of their dominant emotionalism. They are not "heroic" heroes; Raabe, as well as Freytag, can say of his hero that he did not bring fame to the town of his birth. Neither Hans nor Anton becomes a genius, a leader, a unique case; they are representatives alike of a whole class in its ability, its devotion, its undaunted striving upward.

They set out into the world under quite similar circumstances: on foot, at about the same time of year, in the same weather (Nature has throughout a symbolic value for both writers); the lark, the smiling summer day, the verdant fields, the merry salutations of passers-by on the highway, the Jewish companion with such vastly different aims and character, who dampens the hero's fine enthusiasms with intrusions of hard materialism—these elements the two situations have in common.[5]

Then follows in both novels the hero's apprenticeship to life in a large city; his bitter experiences as a servant of aristocracy; his release and return home. Both Anton and Hans are at first daz-

[5] That Raabe was impressed, as it were photographically, by these two figures in this characteristic relation of similarity and dissimilarity, is suggested by the fact that a paler repetition occurs in *Der Schüdderump*, chaps. 16 and 19, Raabe's *Sämtliche Werke*, Berlin-Grunewald (Klemm), III, 1, pp. 165, 194.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

zled by the brilliant social life of the upper classes, and fall for a time under the spell of the daughter of the house they serve. Both are disillusioned when they discover the inanity of aristocratic splendor, and relieved at being finally dismissed, though it be without gratitude or recognition. For both this period of servitude to aristocracy means an aberration from the straight course of their lives; hence they leave it without regret, and return gratefully to associations which their hearts had never wholly renounced.

In both novels the hero has an opposite, a Jewish youth (Veitel Itzig—Moses Freudenstein) who represents false and selfish ambition. He is a contemporary and schoolmate of the hero, and the latter comes into connection with him by protecting him from the violence of their school-fellows. This initiates a friendship that endures until the hero recognizes the divergence of their aims in life. The Jewish boy too has a great zeal for learning, but with far different motives: he sees in it a means to power and wealth and a weapon against his fellow-men. His thoughts and actions are governed not by feeling, but by will and intellect; his cool and scoffing rationalism contrasts sharply with the hero's emotionalism and imaginativeness. His traits of character are the opposite of those of his friend: he is sly, vindictive, selfish, disloyal, unscrupulous; fawning and slavish when at a disadvantage, he becomes aggressive and domineering as soon as he has the upper hand.

He starts out into the world an orphan, with the last savings of his devoted parents in his pockets. Since he is quicker and more clever than the hero, his rise is at first more rapid. Sure of his purpose, he sets deliberately about attaining it; he casts off his boyhood self and the modicum of loyalty that still encumbered him; he is at once at home in the great city, and improves every opportunity. Having achieved affluence, he reveals a hitherto suppressed tendency in his nature, a penchant for gentility. He takes elegant apartments, and leads a double life; he affects finer clothes and associations, while continuing to reap the benefits of his chrysalid existence. Coolly and dispassionately he plans to better his fortunes by marrying a wealthy heiress. But he is finally undone by a rash misdeed committed in spite of his usual cautious selfishness, and the ruins of his spurious success collapse upon him.

In regard to details, to be sure, Freudenstein-Stein's courtship of Kleophea Götz reminds one rather of Fink's amour with Rosalie Ehrenthal. Fink, like Stein, uses his unsuspecting friend, the

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

hero, as a stepping-stone to enter the house of his prey. Stein's social prowess, too, especially his adroitness in conversation and narrative, the manner in which he over-awes the mother and daughter and overlooks the father (who is in both cases a lay figure), point beyond Itzig to Fink. Fink's heartlessness toward Sabine Schröter is paralleled by Stein's toward Fränzchen Götz. And the proud, high-spirited Kleophea meets her match at last in Stein, as Lenore Rothsattel does in Fink.

Elements in the description of Moses are strongly reminiscent of Itzig. It is interesting to compare the picture of Moses, standing like an angel of death at the bedside of his father,[6] with that of Itzig at the death-bed of Bernhard Ehrenthal[7]; in both cases, the demoniacal appearance and actions of the villain are the chief cause of the death of his victim.[8] A more striking resemblance can be seen between this scene in *Soll und Haben* and another in the *Hungerpastor:* Dr. Stein at the bedside of Hans.[9]

Beside the hero in both novels stands a girl for whom he feels at first only friendliness, but whom he gradually comes to love. This girl, Sabine Schröter or Fränzchen Götz, is a gentle, domestic, unobtrusive, nun-like nature; she suffers patiently and silently, and she does not venture a step to save her life's happiness when it slips from her hands. "Still," "bleich," are adjectives most frequently applied to her in both stories[10]; her manner, like her dress, is quiet, subdued; it is significant that she inspires in various persons the adoration due to a saint and martyr.

She has many qualities in common with the hero; in fact she is spiritually so near of kin to him that his attitude toward her long continues to be one of brotherly affection. In his gentle neighbor at table he sees a kindred soul, who deserves his sympathy and protection. So she cherishes her love in secret until the hero finds his way back to her; and it is perhaps no mere accident that, at this happy consummation, her devout heart turns backward to the memory of her mother.[11]

Like the hero, the heroine has in both stories an opposite: Sabine

[6] *Der Hungerpastor*, 12. Aufl., Berlin (Janke), 1901, pp. 87-88.
[7] *S. u. H.*, I, p. 541.
[8] *S. u. H.*, I, p. 543; *Hgp.* pp. 92-94.
[9] *S. u. H.*, I, p. 541; *Hgp.* p. 240.
[10] Cf. her first appearance: *S. u. H.*, I, p. 64; *Hgp.* p. 117.
[11] *S. u. H.*, II, p. 309; *Hgp.* p. 243.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

contrasts with Lenore, and Fränzchen with Kleophea; and neither author has left us in doubt that this is his intention. Sabine and Fränzchen are the type of unostentatious, solid worth. Lenore and Kleophea are more beautiful, and have the advantage of higher social station; they dazzle and attract the hero at first, but he is disenchanted when he discovers their shortcomings; and as their allurements wane he is imbued gradually with another love of slow, sound growth, based on a genuine community of thoughts and feelings. A number of minor correspondences between Lenore and Kleophea could also be pointed out; for example, they both have a talent for drawing, and it is characteristic of both that they like best to draw caricatures.

The family of Theodor Götz has in general a relation to Hans similar to that of the Rothsattels to Anton. They employ him, and he serves them faithfully and well; but they remain inaccessible to this son of the people, for in both cases they wear the "visors" of class prejudice. To both families the hero comes with an exaggerated idea of the superiority of the "higher classes"; in both cases he suffers severe but salutary disillusionment and returns sadder but wiser to a more congenial sphere. The tragic figure of Theodor Götz also bears some resemblance to that other man of wealth and affairs, the Freiherr von Rothsattel, in his bowed and broken condition; and beside each of these bankrupt aristocrats stands a brave and helpful girl.

For all their differences, there is a certain kinship between T. O. Schröter, the brother of Sabine, and the "Bettelleutnant" Rudolf Götz. Under a rather forbidding exterior both conceal great good-nature and a tender heart. They are lovingly devoted to the heroine, their protegée; toward the hero their attitude is benevolent, but not uncritical. Their dearest plan is the union of the hero and the heroine, and they cherish the somewhat unjustified hope that this union will be accomplished simply through the exposure of the two to each other. They are bitterly disappointed when the misguided hero does not recognize the worth of the quiet heroine, which they, the guardians, know so well. But they cannot do anything to determine his choice, and it is a long and anxious interval before they can take the tardy prodigal to their hearts.

Samuel Freudenstein, the father of Moses, has a number of traits in common with Hirsch Ehrenthal, the father of Bernhard. In both novels, also, the hero comes into contact with the father

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

through his friendship with the son. Both fathers are sincerely devoted to their sons, and this devotion is the only redeeming grace in their otherwise hardened and sordid souls. They give their sons the best education they can provide; they do everything in their power to assure them a life happier and richer than their own. In this hope for a future that is to compensate for the ignominy of the past, they are both disappointed, and this disappointment utterly breaks them down.

The club of "Neuntödter" at the Green Tree Inn in Raabe's story, with their amusing rules and observances, are in general suggestive of the association of "Auflader" in *Soll und Haben*, with their qualifications of strength, honesty and liquid capacity. In both novels they furnish a humorous episode not essential to the plot, but having a kind of "kulturgeschichtliches Interesse" for the reader. Certainly the hero is introduced to them under identical atmospheric conditions[12]; and the leader of the Neuntödter, the big, bluff, hearty Oberst von Bullau, is not unlike Vater Sturm, the dean of the Auflader, especially when clad in a fur coat and seen against an East-Prussian background.

An enumeration of the similarities between two works does not, of course, establish the fact that the one influenced the other, though the presumption that this is the fact is strengthened by the numerousness and closeness of the similarities. It is difficult to bring external evidence to bear on the present case. Chronology, to be sure, is in favor of the supposition of an influence of Freytag on Raabe: *Soll und Haben* appeared in the spring of 1855; Raabe's first work, *Die Chronik der Sperlingsgasse*, was published in the fall of 1856, and *Der Hungerpastor* is dated 1864. Freytag's novel, therefore, was published before Raabe made his pseudonymic début, and the author of *Soll und Haben* was a man of established literary reputation before the *Hungerpastor* was written: Freytag's *Journalisten, Technik des Dramas,* and *Bilder aus der deutschen Vergangenheit* had appeared before 1864. It is likely that Raabe, then in his 24th year, read *Soll und Haben* soon after its publication. He was a passionate and omnivorous reader[13]; the lamp in the apprentice's little room over the Creutzsche Buchhandlung in

[12] *S. u. H.*, II, p. 360; *Hgp.* p. 174.

[13] Cf. Hermann Zimmer, *Wilhelm Raabes Verhältnis zu Goethe*, Marburg, 1921, p. 7; Wilhelm Fehse, *Wilhelm Raabes Erwachen zum Dichter*, Madgeburg (Creutz), 1921, pp. 18, 21.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

Magdeburg had often burned far into the night, to the displeasure of his employer.[14] The eager years at Wolfenbüttel and Berlin continued to add book after book to Raabe's store, and it is altogether probable that the vivid impressions of *Soll und Haben* were among the tremendous literary material which the poet carried with him to Stuttgart in the spring of 1862.

To be sure, writers on Raabe, from Adolf Stern[15] to Hermann Junge[16] and Hermann Zimmer,[17] while admitting the enormous extent of Raabe's reading and his astonishing power of absorption from various literatures, have repeatedly averred his essential originality, though few have found it necessary to take refuge, as Zimmer does, in so general a definition of literary influence as that contained in Goethe's well-known conversation with Eckermann.[18]

It is true, also, that Raabe later expressed no commendation of Freytag's novel; among his *Gedanken und Einfälle* occurs the observation: "Es ist mit den Menschen wie mit den Büchern, die man liest; das eine ist einem ans Herz gewachsen und dort geschrieben, wie Wahrheit und Dichtung, das andere liest man nach Tisch auf dem Sofa liegend, wie Soll und Haben."[19] This, however, does not exclude the possibility that Raabe as a young man was strongly impressed by *Soll und Haben*, and that these impressions affected, consciously or unconsciously, a work from which in later life he felt himself so estranged that he classified it disparagingly among his "Kinderbücher."

Nor is Raabe's expressed opinion to be trusted implicitly in these matters. He is reported to have denied, for example, that Schopenhauer had influenced him in the least,[20] whereas so eminent a biographer and friend as Wilhelm Brandes[21] sets forth the deep and lasting effect produced on the novelist by the pessimistic phi-

[14] Cf. Wilhelm Fehse, *Raabe-Gedenkbuch für 1921*, p. 81.

[15] *Studien zur Literatur der Gegenwart*, 3rd ed., Dresden and Leipzig (Koch), 1905, pp. 275 ff.

[16] *Wilhelm Raabe, Studien über Form und Inhalt seiner Werke*, Dortmund (Ruhfus), 1910, p. 7.

[17] *Op. cit.*, pp. 7, 14; cf. also Fehse, *Raabes Erwachen*, p. 23.

[18] Eckermann, *Gespräche mit Goethe*, Dec. 16th, 1828.

[19] *Sämtliche Werke*, III, 6, p. 580.

[20] Cf. Theodor Rethwisch, *Wilhelm Raabe wird fünfundsiebzig*, Leipzig, 1906.

[21] *Wilhelm Raabe; 7 Kapitel zum Verständnis und zur Würdigung des Dichters*, Wolfenbüttel (Zwissler), 1901, p. 9.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

losopher.[22] For that matter, Raabe denied having been influenced by Jean Paul;[23] in fact, he acknowledged contributions only from Manzoni and the elder Dumas, and possibly Thackeray.[24] Even Dickens, with whom Raabe has, first and last, many points of contact, is mentioned in his works only once.[25]

The evidence, in short, is conflicting, and the question of an influence of Freytag's novel on Raabe's cannot as yet be decided with finality. At all events, the facts enumerated above must be considered in the final decision.

WALTER SILZ.

Harvard University.

THE SHELLEY SOCIETY AGAIN

Professor Walter E. Peck, in his article *On the Origin of the Shelley Society* published in *Modern Language Notes* in March, 1923, comments on my article *Shelley's Debt to Alma Murray* in *Modern Language Notes,* XXXVII, 7, and asks for further facts to support the accuracy of certain details. With the gist of my article, Professor Peck appears to agree; his exceptions, if I may draw an inference from the title, bear upon my suggestion that Alma Murray or her friends may have had some part in originating the Shelley Society. As this idea was advanced in the first place only as an interesting possibility and was accompanied by Mrs. Forman's (Alma Murray's) statement that she had nothing to do with suggesting the idea to Dr. Furnivall, it is not a thesis that I care to defend. I do not quarrel with Professor Peck's acceptance of the Society's genesis as stated in the Shelley Society Notebook and Shelley Society Papers, and pleasantly burlesqued in the *Saturday Review.*[1] I do wish, however, to examine individually his four queries as to the accuracy of details, because they seem to me to affect the reliability of my entire article.

[22] Cf. also Ernst Stimmel, *Der Einfluss der Schopenhauerschen Philosophie auf Wilhelm Raabe,* Borna-Leipzig (Noske), 1919.

[23] H. A. Krüger, *Der junge Raabe,* Leipzig (Xenien), 1911, p. 36.

[24] Cf. *Literarisches Echo,* IV (1901-02), p. 41.

[25] Emil Doernenburg and Wilhelm Fehse, *Raabe und Dickens,* Madgeburg (Creutz), 1921, p. 5.

[1] *Shelley Society Notebook,* p. 7. The passage is quoted on p. 33.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

In dissenting from my statement that "the most ambitious and spectacular activity of the Shelley Society was the performance of *The Cenci*" Professor Peck states that from 2300 to 2400 persons witnessed this performance but more than 3000 heard the public rendition of *Hellas* and adds that an orchestra and choir of 120 performers participated in the *Hellas* performance. My original assertion was based rather upon the general importance attached to the performance by the Shelley Society both in the preparation and the subsequent discussion, by the amount of attention given the performance by the press, which was certainly greater than that accorded *Hellas,* and by the distinguished nature of the audience. The *Cenci* performance likewise was ambitious in that it was an effort to settle a disputed point, namely, the acting qualities of the play, whereas the *Hellas* performance was apparently of interest principally from a musical point of view, which had no such close relation to Shelley's reputation as poet or dramatist. These considerations are untouched by the figures cited by Professor Peck and leave me still of the opinion that my original statement does not need modification. The criterion of figures as applied to such a statement seems to me inconclusive, even if the figures available were reliable. This, however, is not the case, and Professor Peck's own figures are slightly misleading. The Shelley Society[2] in 1888 gives the number as 2300 and on page 51 of the same volume as over 2400. Dr. E. S. Bates (*Shelley's The Cenci,* page 27) gives it as 2500. G. E. Woodberry[3] gives it as 2400. The anonymous author of *Shelley's Beatrice Cenci and her First Interpreter* in 1886, immediately after the performance, gives it as 3000. Professor Peck chooses the lowest figures cited for the *Cenci* and states that "more than 3000" heard *Hellas,* without citing his authority, but the actual words of the Shelley Society in its first annual report[4] are "some 3000 people." Thus the numerical difference, a trivial criterion from the first, becomes the difference between tweedle-dum and tweedle-dee.

In his next exception Professor Peck says "Professor White may have other authority than he cites for the statement that Miss Genevieve Ward 'had even attempted to organize a private pro-

[2] *Shelley Society Papers,* appendix p. 9.
[3] Belles Lettres edition of *The Cenci,* introd. xxxiv.
[4] *Shelley Society Papers,* p. 1, 10.

duction' prior to the revival by the Shelley Society of *The Cenci.* The *Shelley Society Notebook,* which he names as his authority, says only 'a private performance to carry out the notion was seriously discussed a very few years ago.'" The passage I cited does not say this *only.* Professor Peck has quoted only half a sentence. The full sentence, in its context is from the *Daily Telegraph* of May 8, 1886[5] and runs as follows: "Every actor or manager of note has, at one time or other, dreamed of the possibility of The Cenci. Macready hesitated and rejected the idea, and so did Samuel Phelps. Miss Genevieve Ward had long a desire to appear as Beatrice Cenci and a private performance to carry out the notion was seriously discussed a very few years ago." In a context discussing projects for staging *The Cenci,* it is plain to me that this sentence means that an effort to bring about a performance of *The Cenci* was made either by Genevieve Ward or her friends—for the purposes of my paper, it makes no difference which. On this point also, I therefore see no reason for changing my original statement.

Professor Peck also thinks I go too far in saying that "the Shelley Society was founded with the avowed primary purpose of producing *The Cenci.*" After quoting the secretary of the society to the effect that the production was "one of the primary objects," Professor Peck says: "The production of *The Cenci* might have been *one* of the primary objects of the Society's founders. It was certainly not the sole purpose of the organization." Here we appear to have a misunderstanding as to the meaning of words. *Primary* and *sole* are not synonymous. My article did not try to show that the production was the *sole* object of the Shelley Society. I quite agree with Professor Peck when he quotes the original prospectus to show that there were other purposes. Indeed, in the very article in question I refer to the Society[6] as "an organized body for promoting the understanding and appreciation of the poet." Following this statement I instanced a number of the Society's productions in an effort to show the Society's general usefulness to the poet's reputation. It is perfectly plain that this is inconsistent with any idea on my part that the Cenci production was the *sole* purpose of the Society. Professor Peck's citation of

[5] Quoted in the *Shelley Society Notebook,* p. 55.
[6] P. 414.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

several additional publications of the Society must therefore be considered in the light of added details rather than as a criticism of the accuracy of my statement. Touching the word *primary,* it is a question for casuists and grammarians as to how many primary purposes any organization may be allowed. The secretary of the Society admits that the production of the *Cenci* was one primary purpose; Professor Peck and I both agree with the Secretary that there were other purposes. Waiving the strict meaning of the word *primary,* I think Professor Peck will probably agree with me that the *Cenci* performance is the one item most largely featured in the *Notebook* and in the press, that it was the principal basis of whatever interest the general public took in the Society, and that, as the Secretary himself stated in explaining the decline in membership, a large part of the members had joined simply on account of the *Cenci* performance and dropped out thereafter.[7] In this point also I cannot agree that the statement to which Professor Peck takes exception is misleading.

In claiming that I overstate in saying that Lady Shelley's *Shelley Memorials,* Forman's edition of Shelley, and Dowden's biography of Shelley have strong affiliations with the Shelley Society, Professor Peck has offered a correction that must be accepted. In the cases of Lady Shelley and Mr. Forman I myself made the statement that their books appeared before the formation of the Society. The authors did become rather prominent members of the Society, as Professor Peck admits, and were associated with the group of Shelley's admirers responsible for the numerous books and articles on Shelley with which my article was concerned, but Professor Peck's correction is valid in that my statement should apply to the authors and not to the books themselves. On the matter of Dowden's biography, I have been unable, like Professor Peck, to show that Dowden was a member of the Society. That he was associated with some of its members is true, as is shown by the statement on page 10 of the Society's first annual report, that a "large amount of important material" was placed at his disposal by the members of the Shelley family and by "some members of this Society." His book was reviewed in the *Athenaeum* of Dec. 11, 1886, "by a prominent member of the Society," the

[7] *Shelley Society: Special Report and Appeal,* 1888-9.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

review being reprinted in the *Notebook*,[8] and a list of twenty-eight reviews and notices of the book is printed on page 155. He was also the author of one of the Sciety's publications, the *Review of Hogg's Memoirs of Prince Alexy Haimatoff*. In this connection I may add to the books listed in both my own and Professor Peck's articles the *Life of Shelley* by William Sharp in the Great Writers series, noted in the second Annual Report[9] as by a member of the Society.

I have no data as to the precise time at which the Shelley Society absolutely ceased to exist, and my phrase "shortly after the production of the play" may therefore be not sufficiently definite.

script . . . . is simply a maze of alterations and corrections. "Hertha," printed in "Songs Before Sunrise" is Swinburne's profession of faith, and has been acclaimed as "one of the greatest poems of the Nineteenth Century" . . . . I have the final manuscript that went to the printer, so this draft shall be yours.'

In an earlier letter, in speaking of the agreement which he had made with Mr. Watts-Dunton that he be given the refusal of all Swinburne manuscripts, Mr. Wise states that it is his habit to make note of "every particle of manuscript for the purpose—firstly—of my Swinburne bibliography and—secondly—for the purpose of future use upon the text of the poems." Yet in his *Bibliography of the Writings in Prose and Verse of Algernon Charles Swinburne,* 1919,[1] he makes no mention of this early draft, noting only his own manuscript.

"The manuscript of *Hertha* (which is in my own possession) extends to six pages written upon five pages of white foolscap paper, one of the sheets having both of its sides occupied by the manuscript."

The Wrenn manuscript of this "most original and powerful of all Swinburne's lyrical writings," consists of but eleven stanzas, all of which are included without change in the expanded poem as published in 1871:

Hast thou known how I fashioned thee,
  Child, underground?
Fire that impassioned thee,
  Iron that bound,
Dim changes of water, what thing of all
    these hast thou known of or found?

Canst thou say in thine heart,
  Hast thou seen with thine eyes,
With what cunning of art
  Thou wast made in what wise,
By what force of what stuff thou wast shapen,
    and shewn on my breast to the skies?

Who hath given, who hath sold it thee,
  Knowledge of me?
Hath the wilderness told it thee?
  Hast thou learnt of the sea?
Hast thou communed in spirit with night?
    have the stars taken counsel with thee?

[1] Vol. I, p. 212.

Have I set such a star
  To show light on thy brow,
That thou sawest from afar
  What I show to thee now?
Have ye spoken as brethren together, the sun
    and the mountains and thou?

What is here, dost thou know it?
  What was, hast thou known?
Prophet nor poet
  Nor tripod nor throne
Nor spirit nor flesh can make answer, but only
    thy mother alone.

Mother, not maker,
  Born, and not made;
Tho' her children forsake her,
  Allured or afraid,
Praying prayers to the God of their fashion, she
    stirs not for all they have prayed.

First life on my sources
  First drifted and swam;
Out of me are the forces
  That save him or damn
Out of me man and woman, and wild-beast
    and bird; before God was, I am.

Beside or above me
  Nought is there to go;
Love or unlove me,
  Unknow me or know,
I am that which unloves me and loves; I am
    smitten, and I am the blow.

The mark that is missed
  And the arrows that miss,
The mouth that is kissed
  And the touch of the kiss
The search, and the sought, and the seeker, the
    soul and the body that is.

I am that thing which blesses
  My spirit elate;
That which caresses
  With hands uncreate
My limbs unbegotten, that measure the length
    of the measure of fate.

Digitized by Google
Original from
UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

But what thing dost thou now,
Looking Godward, to cry
I am I, thou art thou,

With the turning of the page a nervous frenzy seems to have seized the poet. The writing is upside down with that of the other page, the lines are slanting, the stanzas are irregularly placed on the page and badly crowded together; the writing becomes more and more hurried and nervous; and the scratching and interlining more and more frequent until the page ends with the last two stanzas in a tangle and jumble impossible to indicate except by photograph. Yet by close study it is possible to follow the lines and words as written and rejected, and to feel the nervous tension of the writer. And by picking out the unscratched words and phrases, sometimes separated by several lines of scratches, we have the perfect stanzas, fully polished, final.

FANNIE E. RATCHFORD.

Wrenn Library, University of Texas.

BALZAC'S RATE OF PRODUCTION

A rather inflated estimate of the rapidity with which Balzac composed seems to have been quite generally enjoyed both by *Balzaciens* and by casual students. The question of arriving at an exact estimate of his rate of production is obviously a mathematical one; and a five year period should serve as a fair basis for estimating the average monthly volume. However, another question immediately presents itself—*Which* five years? I have settled upon the period 1831-1835 mainly because it encloses the transition period in his works.

By separating the production of this period into two classes, minor works or the articles written for various periodicals, and major works; and by presenting in two parallel columns the figures of their respective volumes, it is made possible to note the relation of the decrease in one to the increase in the other. This is merely a graphical manner of showing Balzac's interest in one type of work giving way to his interest in the type which developed into the *Comédie humaine.* A separate consideration of the minor works provides also a basis for judging their comparative importance by noting the percentage of the minor material which was later incorporated into major works.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

It was in 1830 that Balzac began his hack work for the magazines, although he had complained as early as November of 1829 because he had only six hours of the night to give to the writing of the *Scènes de la vie privée.* His last article in the *Silhouette* appeared Jan. 2nd, 1831, in the last issue of that periodical. He continued writing for the *Caricature* until Jan. 3rd, 1833, missing hardly an issue. In this publication, aside from his series of *Etudes critiques* (Nov. 3, 1831 to Jan. 3, 1833), his articles number sixty-five, the last appearing Apr. 26th, 1832; the worst, *Terme d'avril,* having appeared a week previous. None of them were ever used again; and no part of them, unless it be the character of the *épicier,* for whom Balzac seemed to have a particular penchant. Most of these articles were plain comment or satire, and none worth while as literature. In January of 1831 appeared his first article in the *Revue des Deux Mondes,* the third and last appearing Feb. 15th, 1832. All three were later incorporated into major works. The first article for the *Revue de Paris* appeared in February, 1831; the eleventh and last, Nov. 1st, 1834. Only one of the stories was ever used again. In the *Renovateur* were published

Balzac's tendency toward the writing of *physiologies* and *théories,* so noticeable before 1830, has remarkably diminished. The *Physiologie des positions, -de l'adjoint,* and *-du cigare* are such only in title, and total only seven pages. The *Théorie de la démarche,* although forty-four pages in length, is merely an elongated statement that the author has conceived such a *théorie,* and its exact relation to character is never elucidated. And all four of these products of the dying tendency remarked above were written as minor material primarily. The *Voyage de Paris à Java,* although extremely entertaining and amusing reading, seems a casual product and difficult to classify with any other material of this period. The *Contes drolatiques* (first and second ten) present two hundred and forty-four pages of the author's Rabelaisian façade, by no means unknown to his readers before 1830. Anne Radcliffe, whose student he was as early as 1822, has not been forgotten. There are forty-three pages of *Melmoth réconcilié* and two hundred and forty-four of the *Histoire des Treize,* whose preface begins with her in mind. The remaining material of this period is comprised in the eleven works of it best known to readers of Balzac, or those most properly a part of the *Comédie humaine.* The germ of the *Comédie* appeared first in 1824 in the last of the *oeuvres de jeunesse, Argow le pirate,* in which three characters were carried over from a previous work, the *Vicaire des Ardennes* of 1822. The first suggestion of the *Scènes* was *La jeune fille,* which was begun in 1828, appeared in 1830, and became a part of *La Femme de trente ans* in 1844. The earliest completed *Scène, La Paix du ménage,* was written in July of 1830; and may be considered as the work in which Balzac definitely settled on his type of novel. But it was only in 1833 that he announced the *Comédie humaine.* Consequently, a comparison of the figures given in the appended table not only allows one to trace the transition of Balzac's interest from his minor to his major endeavor, but also supplies information which considerably antedates and serves to predict his own announcement of 1833.

While considering the rate of production in the case of the actually published material, one should give, in an incidental manner at least, some attention to the fact that Balzac wrote much more than he actually published. For example, during 1832 and 1833 he often mentioned *La Bataille* (d'Austerlitz). This never appeared; yet he must have done some, if not a great deal, of work on it. Likewise with many others such as the following:

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

1832	May,	An article (title unmentioned).
	June 10,	*Causeries du soir.*
	Aug. 22,	*Le Maudit* (Perhaps *L'Enfant maudit?*)
	Sept. 1,	*Les Amours d'une laide.*
		Le Marquis de Carabas.
1833	Mar.,	An article *sur le salon.*
	May 26,	*Le Privilège* (*roman historique*).
1835	Oct.,	*Richard Cœur-d'éponge.*

To consider the speed of composition in the case of a single work about which we possess all the necessary information, we may examine that of the *Médecin de campagne.* On Sept. 15th, 1832, Balzac stated that it had not yet been started.[1] On Sept. 23rd he wrote that he had finished it in three days and three nights.[2]—two hundred pages in-18 (which is the page referred to in the appended table). His later letters, however, make it clear that the work was hardly "finished" by September 23rd. In the following March he wrote, "It costs me ten times the work of Lambert.",[3] and on May 26th stated for the second time that it had been finished.[4] The statement of May 26th was more exactly the truth than was that of Sept. 23rd. We have, then, the extreme limits of Sept. 15th, 1832 and May 26th, 1833, or eight months as the actual length of the period during which he composed and prepared this work. And Balzac himself verified the fact that it took eight months for completion.[5] The final rate of production is thus left at twenty-five pages per month for that particular work, but, of course, not his whole time had been devoted to it alone. *La Grenadière,* he wrote, was done in a single night,[6] twenty-four pages. He told his sister that it was physically impossible to write more than twenty pages (in-18) per day [7] and "*. . . quelque jour vous verrez qu'il a fallu bien des heures pour avoir pensé et écrit tant de choses.*" [8] However, after having calculated his average rate of production and finding it to have been less than two pages per day, we can understand that all this conflicting mass of statements is merely an indication of the agony of composition which Balzac underwent before bringing a work to

[1] *Œuvres Complètes de H. de Balzac; édition définitive,* Calmann Lévy, Paris, 1876, xxiv, 143.
[2] *Ibid.,* p. 146.
[3] *Ibid.,* p. 170.
[4] *Ibid.,* p. 172.
[5] *Ibid.,* p. 178.
[6] *Ibid.,* p. 163.
[7] *Ibid.,* pp. 119, 146.
[8] *Ibid.,* p. 129.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

its final form. "*Il n'y a pas de phrase, d'idée, qui n'ait été vue, revue, lue, relue, corrigée; c'est effrayant.*",[8] he said of the *Médecin de campagne* in the sixth month after the date when he had stated that it had been "finished in three days and three nights."

For the following tabulation I have "counted" all the published work for the five year period, using a uniform page unit.

I. *Minor works 1831-1835 inclusive.*

Total number, articles and stories.....94. Number pages....844.
Total number used again............. 5. Number pages....141.

II. *Minor and major production compared.*

	1831		1832		1833		1834		1835	
	Min.	Maj.	Min.	Maj.	Min.	Maj.	Min.	Maj.	Min.	Maj.
Jan.	101.5	..	50	10	13	..	..	..	..	20
Feb.	34.5	16	102	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Mar.	18.5	..	13	..	..	5	..	71	..	..
Apr.	14.5	33	9.5	163	..	244	..	..	..	..
May	62	37	26	40	..	..	..	..	..	43
June	16	13	..	..	..	..	..	43	..	..
July	35	..	..	65	..	61	..	..	..	..
Aug.	13	242	24	..	44	..	..	..	..	..
Sept.	4	..	40	..	..	526	..	..	..	..
Oct.	8.5	..	14	..	..	..	..	179	..	..
Nov.	63	..	84	..	..	39	29	..	..	388
Dec.	17	..	..	..	..	..	..	244	8	222
Tot.	387.5	341	362.5	278	57	875	29	537	8	673

Grand total, Minor..844; Major..2704; Minor and Major..3548. To this *could* be added about 116 pages of *La Femme de trente ans*, published in 1842.

III. *Average number pages per month.*

	Minor.	Major.	Combined.
1831	31.4	28.5	59.9
1832	30.2	23.166	53.366
1833	4.75	72.91	77.66
1834	2.5	44.75	47.25
1835	.666	18.5	19.166

IV. *Average production, minor and major combined, 1831-1835.*

Per month..............59.133 pages.
Per day................. 1.943 pages.

Newton S. Bement.

The University of Michigan.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

AN UNPUBLISHED VERSION OF THE *HISTORIA DE ABINDARRÁEZ Y JARIFA*

Menéndez y Pelayo in his *Orígenes de la Novela*[1] lists the different versions of the Moorish tale, *Historia de Abindarráez y Jarifa,* but fails to mention a manuscript version of the story cited by Gallardo in his *Ensayo de una Biblioteca española de libros raros y curiosos.*[2] This manuscript, a copy of which follows, is in the Biblioteca Nacional (Ms. 1752) at Madrid. The handwriting is of the eighteenth century. The present version unfortunately does not help in solving the problem of authorship and date of composition of the original story. It contains the main elements of the story in their proper sequence, but is too brief for detailed comparison with other versions. The fact that Ronda, and not Antequera, is the frontier town is an anachronism, for Rodrigo de Narváez, the Spanish cavalier, was doubtless not living in 1485, when the Christians captured the city permanently. Might the present version not be an *anécdota ejemplar* of the sort used by the preachers of the period?

Hist^{a} Del moro y Naruaez alcayde de Ronda

En el tiempo que Ronda siendo ya de Xp̄ianos y frontera contra el Reyno de granada abia en ella un caballero de aquella çiudad que se llamaua Naruaez. este como era la costumbre hazia entradas en tierra de moros algunas veces, otras embiaba gente suya que las hiziese. el mismo estilo tenian los moros en todas aquellas fronteras. acaesçio una vez que Narvaez embio ciertos cauallos a correr los quales partiendo de la tierra de granada y yendo por su camino no allaron otra presa sino fue un moro el qual venia de la manera que aqui se dira y por ser de noche no pudo escaparse porque sin pensar dio en los caballos de Naruaez y ellos tambien en el y viendo que no abia otra cosa en que ganar y abisados del moro que toda la campaña estaba limpia otro dia de mañana se volvieron a Ronda y presentaron el moro a Narvaez. el moro era mancebo de hasta veynte y dos o veynte y tres años caballero y muy gentil hombre. traya una marlota de seda morada muy bien guarneçida a su modo una toca corta muy fina sobre un bonete de grana en un cauallo muy excelente y una lança y una adarga labrada como suelen ser las de moros principales Narvaez le pre-

[1] Madrid, 1905, I, ccclxxvi-ccclxxix.

[2] Madrid, 1866, II, apéndice, p. 3.

gunto quien era y el dixo que era hijo de un alcaide de çierto castillo conoçido entre Xpianos por ser hombre de guerra preguntandole donde iba no respondio palabra por que lloraba tanto que las lagrimas le cerraban la abla. Naruaez le dixo maravillo me de ti siendo cauallero y hijo de un alcaide tan valiente y sabiendo questos son casos de guerra estes tan flaco y llores como mujer pareciendo en tu disposiçion buen soldado y buen cauallero. a esto respondio el moro no lloro por verme en prision que ya yo se que es ser captivo ni estas lagrimas son por la perdida de mi libertad sino por otra muy mayor y que me duele mas que verme en la fortuna que me veo. oydas estas palabras Narvaez le rogo mucho que le dixese la causa de su llanto el moro le dixo. Sabete que a muchos dias que yo soy servidor y enamorado de una hija del alcayde de un tal castillo y hela servido con mucha lealtad y muchas vezes e peleado por su seruiçio contra vosotros los Xpianos y ella agora biendo la obligaçion que me tenia era contenta de casarse conmigo y abiame embiado a llamar para que la sacase y venirse en mi compania a mi casa dexando la de su padre por amor de mi y yendo yo con este contentamiento esperando alcançar cosa tan deseada quiso mi mala fortuna que me tomasen captiuo tus cauallos y perdisse mi libertad y todo el bien y buena uentura que pensaba tener. Si esto te parece que no merece lagrimas yo no se con que mostrar la miseria en que estoy. fue tanta la piedad que Narvaez tubo que le dixo tu eres cauallero y si como cauallero me prometes de voluer a mi prision yo te dare liçençia sobre tu fee el moro lo açepto y dandole palabra se partio y aquella noche llego al castillo donde estaba su dama donde tubo muy buena fama de hazelle saber questaba alli y ella se dio tan buena maña que le dio ora y lugar donde la pudo allar a solas. mas todo el raçionamiento del moro fueron lagrimas sin podella ablar palabra y marabillada la mora desto le dixo como es esto agora que tienes lo que deseas pues me tienes en tu poder para lleuarme muestras tanta tristeza. El moro le respondio sabete que viniẽdo a verte yo fui captiuo de los cauallos de Ronda y me lleuaron a Narvaez el qual como cauallero sabiendo mi mala fortuna me hubo lastima y sobre mi fe me dio liçençia que te viniese a ver y assi yo vengo a verte no como libre sino como esclavo y pues yo no tengo libertad no plega a dios que queriendote yo tanto te lleue adonde pierdas la tuya yo me volvere porque e dado mi fe procurare rescatarme y volvere por ti. La mora le respondio antes de agora me as mostrado lo que me quieres y agora me lo muestras mejor pues tienes tanto respeto a mi libertad. mas pues eres tã buen cauallero que miras lo que a mi me debes y lo que debes a tu fe no plega a dios que yo este en compania de nadie sino fuese la tuya y aunque no quieras me e de ir contigo y si fueres esclauo sere esclaua y si dios te diere libertad a mi me la dara tanbien aqui tengo este cofre con dinero y joyas tomame a las ancas de tu caballo que yo soy muy contenta

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

de ser compañera de tu fortuna dicho esto se salio con el y el la tomo a las ancas del cauallo y otro dia llegaron a Ronda donde se presentaron delante de Naruaez el qual los reçibio muy bien y les hizo mucha fiesta dandoles algunas cosas y alabando el amor de la mora y la palabra y verdad del moro otro dia les dio liçençia que se fuesen libres a su tierra y los mando acõpañar hasta ponello en saluo.

George Irving Dale.

Washington University.

SAVIOLO AND HIS PRACTISE

Unacknowledged sources for Elizabethan books are too common discoveries to create surprise, but interest continues and amusement perhaps grows as the list lengthens. I have another item to add to Miss Scott's list of translations from the Italian, which I have not seen noted before. Vincentio Saviolo's lively and urbane discussion of the laws of duelling in his *Practise,* published in 1595, first appeared in Italian in 1558, the work of the scholar and gentleman Muzio.

There is no mistaking the relationship. Saviolo borrows the whole of *Honor and Honorable Quarrels,* the second part of his *Practise,* from Muzio's *Il Duello,* translating in large part literally, sometimes omitting, but adding nothing except a chapter deploring the fashion of secret combat, and at the end accounts of four famous quarrels and an unrelated discussion of the nobility of women. Nowhere does he give any hint that the work is not his own.

Fixing Saviolo's indebtedness settles another little problem in authorship, of which few scholars seem to have been aware.

On December 13, 1589, Richard Jones obtained license to publish a book by Vincentio Saviolo, called *The Book of Honour.* No copy is extant, says Sir Sidney Lee, and as the event shows none was ever printed. In 1590 Richard Jones published *The Book of Honor and Arms,* anonymously except that in the dedication to Sir Christopher Hatton he says:

"But for that your Lordship hath been as well an actor in arms, as a knower of what is due to honor, I omit to say more, either of the one or the other, beseeching your good Lordship to pardon my boldness, and take in acceptable wise the entent of the author, who both by election and obligation acknowledgeth himself yours. Your Lordship's ever to command. Richard Jones."

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

A note inserted between chapters 11 and 12 of the fourth book also leads to the assumption that Jones himself is the author.

"My meaning was here to have inserted all the speeches, emblems, devises, posies, and other compliments, used in all challenges and other public exercises of arms since her Majesty's reign; but for want of observation, or rather lack of some sufficient man to have set them presently down, those things cannot be recovered. Henceforth that defect is like to be supplied by the dextrous hand of Master W. Seager, (now called Somerset), one of her Majesty's Heralds, a gentleman both learned and languaged, and therewith also by his own hand able to express in demonstration, with great art and excellency Whose mind is wholly bent to her Majesty's service, and the honor of her court."

The part of this book which deals with honor is an abridgement of Saviolo's *Honor and Honorable Quarrels.*

Relations were further complicated by the publication in 1602 of William Segar's *Honor Military and Civil,* some chapters of which follow *Honor and Arms* verbatim, although he says in his dedication to Queen Elizabeth,

"I have according to my poore talent endeavored, in discharge of my duty, for the place of service which I hold under your Majesty, by your most gracious favor, to frame these discourses concerning arms, honor and the princely magnificence of your Majesty's court, a subject proper to armorists, and men of my profession, not handled heretofore in our English by them, or any other to my knowledge."

Little attention has been paid to these resemblances between Segar's *Honor Military and Civil, Honor and Arms,* which appeared in 1590, supposedly the work of Richard Jones the printer, and Saviolo's *Practise,* which appeared five years later. Sir Egerton Brydges credits Jones with *Honor and Arms* in *Censura Literaria.* John Anstis in his *Register of the Garter,* (1724) ascribes it to Segar without comment. His authority and Segar's own claim for originality in *Honor Military and Civil,* as well as the appropriateness of the subject to Segar convinces Thomas Moule (*Bibliotheca Heraldica*) that Segar wrote it, and he remarks on the use Shakespeare must have made of it in *As You Like It.* He merely calls attention under notice of Saviolo's book to the resemblance between *Honor and Arms* and Saviolo's *Practise.* In the *Dictionary of National Biography* Thompson Cooper lists *Honor and Arms* among

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

Segar's works and records the likeness between it and *Honor Military and Civil.* Sir Sidney Lee in the article on Saviolo makes no mention of the resemblance to the earlier work, and thinks Shakespeare must have been familiar with Saviolo from certain passages in *As You Like It.* I have not been able to explore the periodicals for further comment.

The facts indicate that for some reason Jones did not publish Saviolo's first book, licensed in 1589, but a year later put out a condensed version of it as his own work with addition of material on the orders of knighthood picked up from historians and antiquarians; very likely Segar himself helped, since they seem to have been well acquainted, or perhaps Jones paid him the same compliment that he gave Saviolo. At any rate later Segar borrows from Jones's book verbatim the matter on duels, and takes over bodily the part on knighthood with a few additions and changes of order. It is difficult to understand why he should not have acknowledged this fact. He may have furnished the notes on the knightly orders and borrowed them back again with interest; and so far as originality was concerned, he may have felt his claim honest enough, since only thirty-seven of his hundred forty-nine chapters had appeared in print before.

The one point that is clear is that Vincentio Saviolo, Richard Jones, and William Segar all were indebted wittingly or unwittingly to Muzio. Shakespeare probably did not get Touchstone's catalogue of lies from the Italian, but whether he took it from Saviolo or Jones, Sir Sidney Lee cannot be sure.

RUTH KELSO.

University of Illinois.

REVIEWS

A History of French Literature, from the earliest Times to the Great War. By WILLIAM A. NITZE and E. PRESTON DARGAN. New York: Henry Holt & Co., 1922. xi + 781 pp. 8vo.

If it had been decided that another full, unbiassed history of French Literature was to be prepared in this country and a poll had been taken to decide what two American scholars were to undertake this long and arduous task, it is not improbable that the choice would have fallen upon Professors Nitze and Dargan. It was

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

known that both of them had special qualifications for this task. Their records as scholars had given particular proof of their competence. It was plain that they would canvass all available records and their wide acquaintance made it probable that they would call into consultation specialists in particular periods. American Romance scholars, therefore, may congratulate themselves that Professors Nitze and Dargan have acted on their own accord as if anticipating such a call, that they have done all that was expected, and have now finished their labor of Hercules. It was in no sense, however, a cleaning of the Augean stables. They are not "new brooms" and they have swept away no traditions. Those of us who have seen Lanson's work corrected and elaborated from edition to edition knew that so compendious a work, which they will expect to make "standard," would involve not only years of preparation and writing but many revisions.[1] Even as I correct the proof of this summary, the first of these revisions has issued from the press and, in this, much progress has been made in the elimination of slips and errors. Fortunately it is not necessary to introduce or to praise the authors, and since my own space has been limited and I should like to break many a lance, I shall omit compliments and generalizations and proceed to a running synopsis and a consideration of details.

The authors are in complete command of the results of modern scholarship. The views they advance are sane, carefully weighed, and aim to give the results of the work of all scholars rather than to stress any favorite theory. Where there are different and even contradictory theories, these are often stated, though we note that in many cases the names of the scholars who have propounded particular theories are omitted. This general procedure is illustrated for instance in the attitude taken toward the *Chanson de Roland.* The full discussion of the epic is followed by a chapter on the lyric and the romance, where Professor Nitze seems to have taken as his principal guides Jeanroy, Birch-Hirschfeld, and Voretzsch.[2]

[1] Recognizing the importance to American Romance scholarship of such a history, my colleagues of the Romance Journal Club at Princeton made it the subject of an evening's discussion. I am indebted to them for many suggestions.

[2] Professor Nitze's use of *sens* as method of narrative treatment is too summary and not in accord with his own admirable study in *Romania*, XLIV, 14-22.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

In dealing with the Matter of Britain, to the study of which the author has already contributed so much, he naturally stresses his own views, though many who cling to Foerster will feel that it is unfortunate not to mention his dissenting opinions. This is particularly true in the discussion of Chrestien's *Ivain,* where Professor Nitze (p. 42) holds that the heroine is "a fairy mistress." In the chapter on Allegory and Early Drama, a discussion on the origin of allegory would have been helpful, and many will feel that it is unfortunate to translate, as N. has here done, the *Dangier* of the *Roman de la Rose* by "Danger." Voretzsch is not mentioned in this connection, though he is closely followed, especially in his treatment of the *Ecbasis Captivi* and the origin of the beast epic.[3]

In Chapter IV we have a discussion of "History, Didactic Literature and Storiology." I confess that the noun "storiology" caused me to stumble on the threshold, but in general it may be safely said that the treatment is adequate. To devote one paragraph to historical writing in verse and five pages to the prose of this period is somewhat out of proportion, but the treatment of the *fabliaux* which follows is excellent, concise and objective, and Professor Nitze wisely refrains from discussing the difficult question of origins. There is an odd error on page 73, where the *Vie de Saint Thomas Becket* is attributed to *Garnier* de Pont-Sainte-Maxence. The article published by Walberg in 1915[4] and his edition of the *Saint Thomas* have, we think, proved without a doubt that we should now write *Guernes* instead of Garnier. On p. 84 we feel that the discussion of the *fabliaux* which is brought to a head in an analysis of *Richeut* would have been, from the literary standpoint, less likely to have been misunderstood, had Professor Nitze omitted the reference to *Manon Lescaut.*

With "The Bourgeois Influence" we enter into the Middle Period and find an excellent introductory statement giving the general setting, the social, political, and linguistic *milieux.* Many students will welcome the space here allotted to this era, neglected in previous manuals. Villon certainly deserves the pages accorded him and the discussion is excellent, but Antoine de la Salle and Jean Gerson would not have suffered had their space

[3] Cf. his *Einführung,* Zweite Auflage, 1913, p. 402 and Nitze-Dargan, p. 64.
[4] Cf. *Romania,* XLIV, 409, n. 2.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

been cut in half. The statement that the author of *Patelin* is "still unknown, though the play has been recently assigned to Guillaume Alexis" deserves correction, for Professor Cons has made this attribution on solid grounds, as the publication of his work will no doubt show. He has also proved that the play should be dated some five years earlier than 1469.

With Part II we enter upon the Renaissance. In Book I, dealing with "Humanism and the Reformation," we are given the general background of the Age of Francis I. Marot's life and work are well presented, though there are probably some who will cavil at the statement that "his great virtuosity" is one of his most striking qualities. In spite of his use of old French forms and occasional *tours de force,* personally I should prefer a word that would connote, not artificiality, but naturalness and sincerity. Of the six pages devoted to Calvin, our only criticism would be that they deal too exclusively with biography and theology. A concluding chapter on "Platonists and Neo-Platonists" leads us on to Book II, "Literary Theories and the Return of the Bourgeois Ideal," wherein the author has discussed with more sympathy and appreciation than is common, the work of Du Bellay, Ronsard, and their school. Though the theories and the work of the *Pléiade* are so well presented, it would perhaps have been in keeping with the character of the treatment here planned to have made it plain that the *Pléiade* School is not a result either of Platonism or Calvinism, the two influences which are treated in this section, but of the Revival of Learning, which has received no special treatment. This is followed by a discussion of the writers of the late 16th century, Amyot, Montaigne, and Brantôme. N. is entirely correct when he says that it would be a mistake to look in Montaigne's writings for any consistent philosophy, though there is, to be sure, a more or less consistent attitude toward life.

The discussion of "Pre-Classicism" (Book III) and of "Classicism" (Book IV) carries us to the end of Professor Nitze's section. The treatment here, as will be seen from the space accorded, is full, though as a result of the many synopses given, it tends to be closely packed. To compensate for this, however, it is well ordered, so that Classicism finally comes before us as the logical result of the social and intellectual changes that have preceded and the treatment of the great dramatists has been un-

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

usually well prepared for in a separate chapter devoted to the drama previous to Corneille.

Book IV opens with a discussion of Louis XIV and the Classical Spirit, which gives us an excellent idea of the social background and is followed by detailed discussions of the great writers of the age. In the concluding chapter we have Boileau and Bossuet, between whom the connection is perhaps not readily discernible. In his desire to escape the personal or idiosyncratic standpoint, even in a period where he has himself contributed no little, Professor Nitze has followed his sources rather closely. So, for instance, in his presentation of the lyric quality of the drama previous to Corneille, the general attitude and theory seem to be those of Lanson's *Esquisse d'une histoire de la tragédie française.*[5] Few American scholars are better qualified to speak of Corneille's ideals, yet Professor Nitze's praise of him is tempered by the usual, perhaps more than the usual, reservations. The résumé of Pascal's work (p. 312) is a fine example of N.'s appreciative writing, but I should like to see deleted the suggestion that Pascal's change of heart can be explained on a Freudian basis. Those who remember Boileau's truculent affirmation that the word for "ass" is in Greek a "noble" word will be inclined to doubt whether he deserves the credit given him (p. 323) for a knowledge of that language.

In the discussion of classical traits we are told that classicism is at once *natural,* artistic, and rational. This statement may lead to endless discussions and I doubt the wisdom of introducing the first adjective. Personally it seems to me that by the French classical writers a line is drawn between what the modern man understands by nature and by art. Nature to the classicists is that which includes the norm. It therefore includes human nature as well as, indeed rather than "wild nature," and is appreciated for this fact. Reason is the faculty by which we discern and abstract the norms, particularly of human action. Nature becomes beautiful, "la belle nature," when apprehended by reason. To create the work of art the artist, therefore must apply *raison* to nature. To the romanticist nature connotes primarily wild nature and the word tends to exclude human nature.

[5] New York, 1920. N. also follows the date given by Lanson in his *Hist. de la litt. fr.* for the death of Mme de Sévigné's husband, though it is given differently by Monmerqué and in Lanson's *Choix de Lettres du XVIIe siècle.*

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

A later school, the Naturalists, will set up a distinction, if not an antithesis, between nature and art, and will prefer what they call nature. The French classicists, perhaps, were better advised in preferring art, though we may all admit that the relation between the two terms was to them not antithetical. I am also inclined to think that the identification of *la raison* on the same page with the "pure reason" and especially of *le bon sens* with the "practical reason" may be confusing. The two terms, pure reason and practical reason, have since Kant taken on so technical a philosophic meaning that I believe they will bewilder rather than help.

One point in the presentation, the use of numerous synopses of works of art, causes me some doubt. A brief synopsis of a Racinian tragedy, for instance, it seems to me, is bound to be what the Frenchmen characterize as a betrayal of the author. It can at best give only the subject matter and not the artistic quality of the writer. A synopsis of Pradon's *Hippolyte* therefore will not differ materially from one of Racine's *Phèdre*. Yet if we are to consider them as literature there is a world of difference. One can safely assume that the ordinary student will not read in the original all of the most important works, and it may be wise to give him something that he can "put his teeth into." However teachers may differ on the value of these synopses, I feel that N. will in subsequent editions wish to revise some of them.

As we have seen, Professor Nitze's share of the work ends with the Classical Period. The line of demarcation between his and Professor Dargan's chapters is very wisely taken as having been the Quarrel of the Ancients and Moderns. The general procedure followed in the second half of the book is very much the same that we have already noted. Possibly it is a shade less well systematized on the one side, and more individualistic in treatment on the other. The same solid scholarship lies behind it, and of course it includes the results of recent research. Here and there we shall find that writers somewhat diverse are brought together under one rubric, and so for instance, in Chapter II we have that strayed sheep of Classicism, Fénelon, treated with La Bruyère, with whom he has some affinities, and with Saint-Simon, with whom he has none. In accordance with the general plan, Chapter III is devoted to 18th Century history and society, but the history really occupies only two pages, while the rest of the discussion is given over to the social system and the salons. It was doubtless the

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

pressure for space that made it impossible to treat more at length the end of the Age of Louis XIV or to sketch the general disintegration which was to set in. Although the various salons are in general admirably characterized, it would have helped to knit the two parts of the book more closely together had we had a comparison of Mme de Tencin's "menagerie" with one of the salons of the Classical period, say Mme de Rambouillet's or Mme de Sévigné's household. When we step into Mme de Tencin's salon we step into a new civilization as well. Her career may well be taken as a land-mark in the intellectualizing of French society, for she was not only as D. gallantly puts it, "ex-mistress of the regent and others"; as a *déclassée* from the 17th century standpoint she possessed yet other qualifications, as P.-M. Masson has abundantly shown.[6] She was also a run-away nun. As compared to Mme de Rambouillet's therefore, Mme de Tencin's salon is socially somewhat hugger-mugger and intellectually decidedly liberal. The age of authority is passed, or at least is rapidly passing.

In Book II we have a discussion of the new philosophy in which Bayle and Fontenelle are treated. I suspect that Professor Dargan is not fond of Fontenelle, for I seem to scent reproof even in the notice of his death, where we are told that he died "in the odor of serenity." "One cool squirt" of disapproval has been sprayed over the four and a half pages devoted to the long-lived popularizer.

Voltaire, as is proper, has, all told, 22 illuminating pages devoted to him. His "chaos of clear ideas," as Faguet has characterized his work, invites discussion, but the thing that I miss when I have read it all is the sense of Voltaire's greatness. Possibly more might have been said of his work as critic, and mention might have been made of his ideals of *bon goût* and of *nous autres honnêtes gens* (p. 417). D.'s attitude may be summed up in his phrase "In his rather dessicated soul, in his adroitness, wit, finish, and everyday wisdom, he typifies the age which he adorns and which he strove on the whole to ameliorate." Under the rather harsh filing of such phrases, the sage of Ferny is "polished off." Voltaire is refined away. He fades into the light of common day. What I miss is the sense of Voltaire's distinction, that distinction which led one of his contemporaries to say of him, "Il a plus que tout le monde l'esprit que tout le monde a."

[6] P.-M. Masson, *Mme de Tencin*, 1910, p. 21.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

En revanche, Montesquieu comes off very well. Indeed, the ten pages on him constitute one of the best critical estimates of the author of *L'Esprit des Lois* that we have. The treatments of Diderot and Rousseau are fair and adequate, where so much is necessarily matter for controversy, though I feel the assertion that Rousseau wrote his famous *Discours* "probably under the influence of Diderot" is hardly warranted. Of the remaining figures of the 18th century Buffon has been exceptionally well treated, while I am surprised to notice that one who himself has so fine a touch as Professor Dargan should have written down Marivaux. Though I agree with Professor Dargan that the *drame bourgeois* is of "little artistic significance," I think its historic importance deserved more than the author's closing sentence.[7]

After this excellent treatment of the 18th Century, I looked forward to Book V, "Pre-Romanticism," with high hope. I must admit I was disappointed and after D. has failed to do it, I begin to wonder whether it can be done. We begin with Rousseau and Bernardin de Saint-Pierre and pass on to Mme de Staël and Benjamin Constant. But somehow the nexus escapes us or at least it escapes me, and I feel that possibly here the treatment of the historical background has been unfortunately neglected. A single paragraph and that a more or less perfunctory one, is devoted (p. 496) to the French Revolution, and almost nothing is said of its effects. This is one of the three periods in which the treatment of the historical background appears to me inadequate: the Hundred Years War, the second half of the 16th Century, and the French Revolution.

Once the movement is under way, Professor Dargan's treatment is not only adequate, it is often brilliant. Where all is good and much is excellent, the chapters on Chateaubriand,[8] de Vigny, Lamartine, Sainte-Beuve, and Balzac stand out. Professor Dargan's attitude here may be characterized as open-minded and appreciative. His fine artistic sense has not allowed itself to be deeply influenced by the *charges à fond* which have been delivered

[7] P. 433. In this chapter I note that the date of Gresset's *Le Méchant* is still given as 1745, though a study by Professor Stuart has, I think, fixed it as two years later. Cf. *M. L. N.*, XXVII, 43, n. 9.

[8] The descriptions of nature in *Atala* are called both accurate and picturesque, but the truth is they were so picturesque that they ceased to be accurate.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

against the Romantic artists, and while he sees the weakness of individual philosophies, he appreciates to the full the aesthetic quality of this work. He recognizes fully the importance of the contributions they made in liberating the drama, though he considers the later realistic theatre superior to the work of the generation of 1830. A further word might have been added on the importance of the service rendered in introducing new verse forms and opening the doors to an enrichment of vocabulary. But the difficulty of setting the Romantic Humpty-Dumpty together again seems to have nonplussed Professor Dargan as it has his predecessors. Unfortunately there is frequently an overlapping of one period into the succeeding era, and a particular author is sometimes projected forward ahead of the time with which we have been made familiar. Thus, for instance, *Werther* is not mentioned until page 522, when we have finished with the attitude which it is supposed to have caused and the works which it influenced, like *René* and Benjamin Constant's *Adolphe* (page 511). The first mention of Sainte-Beuve's *Tableau de la Poésie française au XVIe siècle* occurs on page 635, although as a literary historical force the *Tableau* influenced the Romantic poets who have been discussed 100 pages earlier (page 534). So the discussion of Hugo's entire dramatic career has been concluded before we are told of Dumas' *Henri III et sa Cour* which was really the most important of the early Romantic *drames.*

Maurice de Guérin certainly deserves honorable mention, and he is here, as unfortunately in Lanson, passed over in silence. But where I am grateful for so much, it would be ungracious to pick a quarrel for so little, and I shall confine myself to a few rectifications of detail.

On page 530 we are told that Lamartine was elected Deputy in 1831, and we are given to understand that he had previously been defeated and that this date is a turning point in his career. The date itself is, to be sure, a turning point, but it is incorrect. Lamartine was made a candidate in 1830 but was defeated. He was not elected to the Chamber until 1833 and took his seat after his return from the famous *Voyage en Orient,* which really marks the close of one period in his life.

In the discussion of Hugo (p. 535) we are told that "marital responsibilities hastened his productivity and he brought out the first volume of *Odes et Ballades,* 1822." The order of events is

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

here inverted. The title was not *Odes et Ballades,* but *Odes et Poésies Diverses.* It was as a result of the publication of this volume in June that in September a pension of a thousand francs was allotted to him by Louis XVIII which made possible the marriage which followed in October. (Cf. Dupuy, *La Jeunesse des romantiques, Victor Hugo—Alfred de Vigny.* Paris, 1905, pp. 47-59.) The drowning of his daughter is dated 1841 instead of 1843. The phrase *il n'y a plus de jeunes gens* (p. 558) is attributed to Gautier instead of Célestin Nanteuil.[9] In the discussion of Stendhal (p. 565) we are told that he took a "creditable" part in the Napoleonic Campaigns. The adjective is debatable.

In general it may be said that Professor Dargan gives us fewer synopses than does Professor Nitze. In some of them, however, he has been forced to sacrifice accuracy to brevity. So, for instance, we are told that in *Le Rouge et Le Noir* Julien "slays his first mistress when she betrays him to his second" (p. 566). Julien does not slay Mme Renal. She recovers from the wound which he inflicted and the closing section of the novel deals with his changed attitude toward her, and she is with him at the time of his death. Likewise in Flaubert's *Bouvard et Pécuchet,* the two heroes are not "two retired merchants," they are two copyists.

In discussing the drama of Alfred de Vigny, we are told (p. 562) "He was first inspired by the English actors to produce certain Shakespearian adaptations, (*Othello,* 1829; *Shylock,* never acted)". Vigny's first translation of Shakespeare was not *Othello,* or, as he called it, *Le More de Venise,* but *Romeo and Juliet,* which had been finished and accepted for presentation by the Théâtre Français some time before May 1, 1829. In the discussion of George Sand (p. 574), D. divides her work into periods. The first period he characterizes as the "epoch of *l'amour-passion* in which the authoress expresses her violent reaction from her house of bondage and proclaims the rights of free love." He gives this period as extending from 1832 to 1840. Under no possibility do I see how *Mauprat* could be included in this period of *l'amour-passion.* It is and should be taken as indicating the beginning of the second period, for instead of advocating, it attacks the idea of *l'amour-passion,* and its date is properly 1837, which must mark the close of the first period. The third period (c. 1848-60) is filled "by

[9] Cf. Maxime Du Camp, *Gautier* (Grs. Ecrs. ed.), p. 43.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

her love of outdoor nature and country-folk," yet *La Mare au Diable* and other pastoral novels, which certainly belong in this period, have been shown by Karénine to have been begun or written as early as 1844.[10] The date of Taine's entry into the *Ecole Normale* is given as 1845 which is three years too soon.[11]

CHRISTIAN GAUSS.

Princeton University.

The Sonnets of John Milton. By JOHN S. SMART, M. A., D. Litt., Glasgow: Maclehose, Jackson and Co. Pp. x, 195.

In this volume, consisting of a preface, an introduction, the text of the sonnets together with notes and valuable biographical matter, Dr. Smart has greatly increased our knowledge of Milton and his friends. It is a book that no student of the Sonnets can afford to do without.

The introduction in the main is satisfactory. In it is traced the sonnet tradition in Italy, as well as Milton's relations with his English and Italian predecessors. Evidence is given to show that M. was influenced by Della Casa and Tasso, rather than by the Petrarchan conventions. Dr. Smart's remarks on the English form as practiced by Surrey and Shakspere (pp. 19 f) should, however, be supplemented by statements in a valuable article that has recently appeared (O. F. Emerson, "Shakespeare's Sonneteering," *Studies in Philology,* xx (1923), particularly pp. 118 f.). Milton, Dr. Smart shows, was not slavish. His "position . . . is not due to any sudden breaking away from an outworn convention. It is due to his greatness as a poet, the wide compass of his powers, the extent of his reading, his many-sided character, and his interest in life, literature, society, politics and religion." As a result, he was "free from the two marked failings of earlier English sonneteers—indiscriminate borrowing and self-repetition" (p. 42). One is pleased to find the author emphasizing the fact that the man Milton as revealed in his sonnets was not a "gloomly recluse, without geniality and difficult of approach." The poems, on the

[10] Cf. W. Karénine, *George Sand, Sa Vie et ses œuvres,* Paris, 1912, III, 637.

[11] Cf. H. Taine, *Sa Vie et sa correspondance,* Paris, 1905, I, 41.

Digitized by Google

Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

other hand, show a person of "cheerful instincts, open and accessible, courteous and humane" (p. 44). In short, the sonnets reveal "his hours of social ease and kindness" as well as a "variety of . . . ties and associations" (pp. 44 f.).

Unfortunately, the introduction is poorly documented. We, of course, had a right to expect an account of what was already known, with full references. Instead, we find unaccountable statements as well as some serious errors, the result of an amazing disregard of recent research. When Dr. Smart says, for example, that the sonnet "first appeared in Italy in the twelfth century" (p. 3), he should have substantiated so important a statement by reference. Indeed, this remark—for the unequivocal acceptance of this date has long since been rejected—reveals an all-too common shortcoming in Dr. Smart's book, namely, his insularity. Or must this lack of documentation be accounted for on the ground of a fear of "pedantry'" (cf. p. 25)? If so, it is high time for British scholars—they stand singularly alone—to relegate to the iniquity of oblivion this bogey of the Renaissance. One suspects, however, in the light of other remarks in the volume that Dr. Smart errs in the direction of insularity. But surely it is inexcusable for any student of Milton to disregard the renascence of interest in that poet in this country. American scholarship may now safely quote the memorable line in *Paradise Lost* (IV. 830).

On the earliest sonnet in Italy no student, of course, can afford to overlook the following contributions: E. H. Wilkins, "The Invention of the Sonnet," *Modern Philology,* XIII (1915), pp. 463 ff.; E. F. Langley, "The Extant Repertory of the Early Sicilian Poets," *Pub. Mod. Lang. Assoc.* XXVIII (1913), pp. 454 ff.; Langley, "The Poetry of Giacomo da Lentino," in *Harvard Studies in Romance Languages,* I (1915). Wilkins, for example, states (p. 463) that the earliest group of Italian sonnets (thirty-one, twenty-four or twenty-five of which were by Lentino) were written "presumably, within the period 1220-50." And Langley ("Lentino," p. xxv): "There can therefore be little doubt that the Notary (Lentino) deserves the honor of being the earliest master of the sonnet, and it is quite possible that he was its inventor." Dr. Smart's observations on Dante's and Petrarch's employment of the alternate order (*abab, abab*) are also misleading. In each of the thirty-one sonnets already referred to this rhyme-scheme like-

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

wise occurs. The discussion of the tercet (p. 15) may also be supplemented by Langley and Wilkins. These thirty-one sonnets have three rhyme-schemes, two of which are found in Petrarch (*cde, cde* and *cdc, cdc*). It may not be irrelevant also to call attention to Professor Wilkins's remarks on the origin of the quatrain and the sestet (pp. 478 ff.). Dr. Smart's statement on the subject matter of the Italian sonnet also should be supplemented by Wilkins (p. 477). One suspects that Dr. Smart (p. 47) in his otherwise excellent discussion of "O Nightingale" and (Sir John) Clanvowe, was unfamiliar with the life of this fourteenth century knight and his relations with Chaucer (cf. Kittredge, (*Mod. Phil.*, I (1901), pp. 1 ff.; Lowes, *Pub. Mod. Lang. Assoc.*, XX (1905), 753 ff.; also, a less important article, Waugh, "The Lollard Knights," *Scottish Hist. Review,* 1914 (XI), 75 ff.). On the sonnets as practiced after Milton's time (cf. Smart, pp. 24 f.), all students must now refer to a valuable work that has recently appeared (R. Havens, *The Influence of M. on English Poetry.* Harvard University Press, 1922). Though Dr. Smart rightly corrects Watts-Duncan and his successors on a misreading of a passage in Dante, he is nevertheless wrong in his discussion of the suspense or turn in a sonnet (pp. 34 ff.). "In all cases but two," says Wilkins (p. 467) of the thirty-one sonnets, "a full stop in the sense occurs at the end of the octave; and there is a lesser sense pause in these two cases." From this it is evident that the earliest sonneteers felt a pause at the end of the eighth line. Again, the theory of the quatrain, *i. e.,* a turn after the eighth line, was not (as stated by Dr. Smart, p. 35) "first proclaimed in the *Athenæum*" in 1881, but by Wordsworth in 1833 (cf. Havens, p. 487 n.).

The sober and restrained remarks accompanying each of the English sonnets are excellent; though here again one wishes that the book were better documented. Nor is Dr. Smart's purpose in his notes clear. He has not touched on all the subjects which one might expect to find in a comprehensive study. Moody and Browne, for example, are fuller in many instances. But the author's extensive knowedge of Italian literature has enabled him to find where M. got much of the stuff for his loom. The amount of fresh information on the persons commemorated in the sonnets is impressive. He shows conclusively that it was Edward and not

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

Henry Lawrence whom M. addressed. The facts concerning Mrs. Catherine Thomason (not Thomson) reveal more clearly than ever before Milton's cultivated London circle. Particularly sympathetic and suggestive are the remarks on the sonnet "To a Virtuous Young Lady." No less welcome is the light thrown on the poet's second wife, hitherto all but a name. Dr. Smart also makes clear that Milton's admiration for Cromwell was not as uncritical as hitherto thought. "On the occasion when the Sonnet was written, Cromwell and Milton met on common ground as supporters of religious toleration" (p. 89). In only one instance, as regards interpretation, would the reviewer take issue with Dr. Smart (who follows Masson), viz., that M. in "The Assault" is "half-jesting" (p. 46); and that "while suspense and anxiety prevailed around him in the city, Milton, with his inflexible composure, remained calm and detached, and converted the moment of peril into a theme for slightly playful verse" (56 ff.). M. was at this time in his early thirties, and as Professor Hanford has observed (*Modern Phil.*, XVIII (1921), p. 483) after the composition of the "Nativity Ode" (Christmas, 1629), Milton's poetry "takes on a decidedly higher and more serious tone." A parallel situation may be found in the case of a poet with inexhaustible humor, Chaucer. The B-version of the Prologue to the *LGW*, composed in the critical days of 1386, contains little or no playfulness. That M. consequently, in whom an absence of humor is a characteristic, should have chosen an equally trying moment tc be humorous is highly improbable.

One wishes that Dr. Smart had discussed the scansion of certain lines: for example,

While the jolly hours lead on propitious May (p. 47).

One is surprised, also, to find that all the poet's rejected readings have not been included in the volume. As everybody knows there is no more illuminating commentary on the art of poetry than the poet's own revision of his work. This holds true of M. also, even to the extent that Lamb could write: "How it staggered me to see the fine things in their ore! . . . I will never go into the workshop of any great artist again." Some attention likewise might have been given to obsolete rhymes: the rhyme, for example, of *save* and *have* (p. 121). Here doubtless as in Shakspere the *a* (long) in *save* has the sound of *a* in *hat*. This pronunciation still

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

survives apparently in Yorkshire (cf. *Shakespeare's England,* 1916, II, p. 542). The rhyme of *God* and *load* (Smart, p. 78) is also obsolete. The latter word was seemingly pronounced to rhyme with *broad* (*broad* is the only instance to-day of the Shaksperian pronunciation of long *o* (*oa*); cf. "S's England," *op. cit.,* p. 543).

The discussion on Milton's Italian sonnets is sound, and the identification of the lady's name (Emilia) is ingenious and convincing. The "allusion to the name of Emilia is in the manner of these Italian amorists, and owes the obscurity which has shrouded it from all eyes for more than two centuries only to its brevity and compression" (pp. 143 f.). In assigning an early date for these sonnets, however, he was anticipated by two scholars in this country (cf. D. H. Stevens, *Mod. Phil.,* XVII, 1919, pp. 25 ff.; J. H. Hanford, *ibid.,* XVIII, pp. 475 ff.).

In conclusion it may be said that Dr. Smart, in spite of his shortcomings, has done an excellent piece of work. His criticisms are sound and suggestive, and written in an attractive manner.

For the following valuable comments I am indebted to my colleague, Professor Lemmi, whose modesty is matched by his wide reading both in English and Italian literature. "The picture of the youthful shepherdess," says Smart of the third sonnet, "is original and Miltonic." Hardly original; cf. Petrarch, Madrigal I:

Ch'a me la pastorella alpestra e cruda
Posta a bagnar un leggiadretto velo.

Notice that *bagnare* means to wet, and not, as Smart translates, to water. While therefore applicable to the wetting of a veil, it is not to the watering of a plant, and it would not have come into Milton's mind if he had not been thinking of Petrarch's lines. Cf. also Petrarch's Canzone, v. 30 ff.:

Quando vede 'l pastor calare i raggi
Del gran pianeta al nido ov 'egli alberga,
E imbrunir le contrade d'oriente.

On Milton's

sotto nuova idea
Pellegrina bellezza, che 'l cuor bea (No. 4)

Smart remarks: "The Platonic *idea* had already found a place in Petrarch." The passages cited (from Sonnet CXXVI) seem much less suggestive than other lines from the same poem, and particularly from No. CXXVII. Cf., *e. g.,*

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

Milton: Diodati—e te'l dirò con maraviglia—
Petrarch: Amor et io sì Pien di maraviglia
Milton: Portamenti alti onesti, e nelle ciglia
Quel sereno fulgor d'amabil nero
Petrarch: Dal bel seren delle tranquille ciglia
Sfavillan si le mie due stelle fide.

Smart (p. 154) believes that "*Scosso mi il petto,*—is almost certainly a printer's error. The true reading is probably *Sotto il mio petto.*" I doubt it. It is true that Smart's "Sotto il mio petto" has an analogue in Milton's *Elegia Prima*; but the printer would surely be an ingenious one who should twist "Scosso mi il petto" into "Sotto il mio petto"; and also, if analogy with Latin did not induce Milton to intend it, Italian certainly did not, for "Sotto il mio petto" would have been as unidiomatic in Italian as "under my breast" would be in English. I suspect that Milton meant to say that the tempest of his passions was pent up in his passion-shaken breast, and that he used the word *scosso* (shaken) as a locative, possibly misled by analogy with the Latin. In omitting the preposition and article he committed a sin of omission—his besetting sin in Italian. In the same poem he makes another slip of the same kind: "né sentì pria" should be "né tale sentì pria," the "such as" in Smart's translation being omitted. The following are omissions of this sort: Sonnet 2 (p. 144, l. 7); the Canzone (p. 148, l. 5); Sonnet 6 (p. 154, l. 2); *ibid.* (l. 13).

Goucher College. ERNEST P. KUHL.

Heliand und Genesis, hrsg. von OTTO BEHAGHEL. Dritte Aufl., der Heliandausgabe vierte Auflage. Halle, Niemeyer, 1922.

This new edition contains a number of emendations. Lines 937b-938a are set off by dashes as proposed by Heusler, *Zeitschrift f. d. Altertum,* LVII, 20. In l. 941 the reading of the Cotton Ms. *bodo* is replaced by the *bodon* of the Munich Ms. Sievers, *ZfdA.* XIX, 70, and Piper consider the reading *bodo* the better. The writer prefers the genitive *bodo* because the position of *bodo* as nominative is very awkward. Line 1054, the punctuation suggested by Rieger and again by Koch is introduced. A decided improvement. L. 1317, *fridusama* C instead of *fridusamo* M is probably a misprint. Or does Behaghel construe the word as an adjective? The reading *-samu* in the Vatican Ms. precludes this. L. 1322, *eft* is added to the second half-line, a conjecture Roediger's

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

in *AnzfdA*. V, 280. Line 1660, *ôđarhuueđar* is printed as one word just as in l. 3628. L. 2029, *gitrûoda*, the reading of the Cotton Ms. L. 2579, *sia* Cotton Ms. L. 2858, *drôgun* is placed in the first half-line, thereby destroying the rhythm of both half-lines. L. 3881, *thô* instead of *tô* M; not so good (Cf. 3949a, 5459a, 5493 where *tô* is construed with *âhtien*). L. 4127 (also 5409, 5413, 5470), *hêri* instead of *heri*; cf. *PBB*. XLIV, 340, 506. L. 4175, comma after *uueldi*. L. 4190, *thô* in MC is omitted. Makes rhythmically a better line, but compare the arrangement suggested by Ries. Lines 4203, 4562, 5141, 5179 *pâscha* instead of *pascha*. L. 5131, *thiodo* C replaced by *thiod* M; cf. Sievers, *Anm.* L. 5544, *dereƀia man, . . .* instead of *dereƀia mann*. L. 762, *Ȇrodes* changed to *Ȇrôdes*. L. 881, *lêđ* again becomes *lêđas*, the reading of the Mss.

In the *Genesis* the following changes were made: line 14, *liahta* for Ms. *liatha*. L. 61, the reading is now *thînum* (Braune) instead of *thînun* (Hench). L. 82, *Âdama* is now *Adama*. L. 287, a new sentence is begun with *Ûhtfugal* as suggested by Klaeber.

In the marking of the long vowels in proper names there is considerable confusion. In a number of cases where a long vowel is not absolutely essential to the scansion of a line it is perhaps better to leave that vowel undetermined, but in not a few instances it is imperative to mark the quantity. Line 19, read Lûcas; l. 71, Erôdes (cf. lines 548, 728); l. 606, *Ȇrodesa*; l. 757, *Iosepe* (cf. l. 769); lines 711, 776, *Iosep*; l. 977, *Iôhannes*; l. 1114, *Sâtanas*; l. 1262, *Thômas*; l. 1265, *Iâcob*; l. 3257, *Iêsu* (cf. 326, 3557); l. 4370, *Lôth*; l. 5958, *Ȇmaus* (cf. Sievers, *ZfdA*. XIX, 49; Kauffmann, *PBB*. XII, 352); l. 5972, *Bêthania*. In the *Genesis:* l. 84, *Adamas*(?); l. 290, *Lôđa;* l. 332, *Lôhthas*.

The following misprints have been noted: page xxii, line 25, read *hochdeutschen*; p. xxx, l. 21, *Altsächsischen*; line 111, *mid*; l. 117, quotation mark before *uualdanda*; l. 141, *huuô*; l. 198, *uurdi-*; l. 258, *sie*; l. 273, *thô*; l. 280, *mannun*; l. 292, *breostun*; l. 359, *Bethleem*; l. 374, *giuuorden* (C *giuuorđan*); l. 399, *giboran*; l. 403, *fîđan*; l. 474, *briostun*; l. 512, *uurdigiscapu* (C *uurđigiscapu*); l. 640, *hardlîco*; l. 738, *iro*; l. 759, *Nîlstrôm*; l. 808, *uuiha*; l. 810, *endi*; l. 865, *Iohanne*; l. 873, *Iordan*; l. 881, *lêđas*; l. 952, *quâmun*; l. 1035, *mid*; l. 1064, *gêrfîund*; l. 1153, *bi*; l. 1170, *sô*; l. 1176, *tha*; l. 1191, *iungoron*; l. 1205b, *endi uuâres sô filu*; l. 1261, *gôde*; l. 1308, *gelustid*; l. 1325, *1325*; l. 1381, *sô*; l. 1395, *stâd*; l. 1420, *bithiu*; l. 1526, *ôdres*; l. 1556, *alamôsna* (? cf. glossary); l. 1624, *lêdlîc*; l. 1690, *hîr*; l. 1761, *is*; l. 1783, *faho* (cf. glossary); l. 1821, *teslaad*; l. 1882, *sô*; l. 1948, *iuuuom* M; l. 1953, *êldes*; l. 1994, *imu*; l. 2043, *hladen*; l. 2135, *endi*; l. 2140, comma after *thiustron*; l. 2153, *gilêstid* M; l. 2157, *thô;* l. 2178, comma after *tô*; l. 2189, *uunnea*; l. 2369, *mid*; l. 2400,

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

trada (cf. glossary); l. 2587, *lêđlîca*; l. 2625, *oft*; l. 2658, *gimêđlîc*; l. 2754, caesura space between *liudiun* and *endi*; l. 2822, *arƀêdiu, lebdin*; l. 2871, *âno*; l. 2943, *drîƀen*; l. 2982, *oƀar*; l. 2991, *sulicun suhtiun*; l. 3018, *thînun*; l. 3091, *dôđe*; l. 3136, *paradîse* (cf. glossary); l. 3335, *gileƀod*; l. 3392, *sie*; l. 3398, *giƀod*; l. 3405, *dôđe*; l. 3495, *uuerold;* l. 3532, *dôđe;* l. 3552, *gihôrdun;* l. 3572, comma after *tô*; l. 3624, *manages*; l. 3653, *êuuig*; l. 3663, *sie*; l. 3740, *ût;* l. 3753, *sô;* l. 3767, *êrine;* l. 3915, *gilôƀid te;* l. 3960, *giuuonoda*; l. 3998, *duome*; l. 4077, *lêia* (cf. glossary); l. 4125, *sô*; l. 4165, *ferhu*; l. 4169, *oƀarmôdie*; l. 4215, *hetelîc*; l. 4255, *hladen*; l. 4320, *afhaƀen, endi*; l. 4345, *4345*; l. 4349, *mîn*; l. 4370, *biûtan*; l. 4378, *Krist*; l. 4388, *skêdid* (cf. glossary); l. 4402, *uuerđlîco*; l. 4451, *gigareuuid*; l. 4644, *fulgangen* C; l. 4728, *endi*; l. 4778, *uurd* (l. 4619, *uurđ*); l. 4815, *Iûdas*; l. 4841, *niutlîco*; l. 4854, *antstanden* M; l. 4917, *herubendiun*; l. 4938, *uuas*; l. 4957, *magađ, unuuânlîc*; l. 4963, *mêđ*; l. 4997, comma after *thô*; l. 5070, *forđ*; l. 5095, *endi*; l. 5110, *5110*; l. 5199, *an*; l. 5324, *uuordon*; l. 5348, *suôtera*; l. 5415, *5415*; l. 5419, *haƀda*; l. 5527, *grimmo*; l. 5552, *Nazarethburh*; l. 5560, *te*; l. 5606, *paradŷse* (cf. glossary); l. 5701, *seola,* in the *Genesis* with a long *ê*; l. 5702, *côlodun* C; l. 5738, *bigruoƀun*; l. 5776, insert *thuo* after *im*; l. 5798, *an sciann* (cf. Holthausen, *PBB.* XLVI, 337); l. 5811, *uulitie*; l. 5837, *gie*; l. 5890, *uuîdo*; l. 5916, *mid*; l. 5943, *hie.* In the footnotes read: page xiii, line 8, *den*; p. xxviii, l. 2, *Kail*; p. 4, l. 1, *nur*; p. 7, l. 5, *grurio quamun*; p. 8, l. 3, *134*; p. 35, l. 5, *hellea*; p. 36, l. 4, *herren*; p. 40, l. 1, *uuigo*; p. 41, l. 5, *1143*; p. 42, l. 3, *iordana*; p. 67, l. 2, *1879,* l. 4, *uuredes* is not in the third edition; p. 80, l. 3, *2266*; p. 100, l. 4, *gerno: drogun*; p. 101, l. 1, *enuualdan*; p. 119, l. 1, *thena*; p. 121, l. 1, *uppuuego*; p. 124, l. 4, *es*; p. 126, l. 2, place *C* before *uuelda*; p. 137, l. 3, read *uuell* for *uuel* and *wel* for *weil*; p. 147, l. 2, *negen*; p. 160, l. 3, read *Punkt* for *Komma*; p. 164, l. 1, Sievers has the second half-line end with *uuidersaco* (cf. *ZfdA.* XIX, 52); p. 192, l. 3, *50*; p. 194, l. 9, *Piper*; p. 198, l. 3, *sorogia.*

Misprints in the *Genesis:* l. 5, read *sulicaro lognun*; l. 14, *liatha*; lines 24-26 should be at the top of page 235, and the anglosaxon 849-851 at the bottom of page 234; l. 28, comma after *bruođar;* l. 33, *huuar*; l. 38, *huar*; l. 40, *suîđo*; l. 49, *seola*; l. 51, *hue*; l. 71, *thô*; l. 74, *thu*; l. 75, *thoh*; l. 76, *uuaros*; l. 78, *uuorđon* Ms.; lines 84, 88, *uuarđ*; l. 93, *uuunnia*; l. 100, *thegnos*; l. 121, *ni*; l. 123, *uuôhsun*; l. 125, *tuisk*; l. 130, *uuas*; l. 140, *lêđo*; l. 143, *scarapun*; l. 144, *huiriƀit, seola* with short *ĕ* as in the *Heliand*; l. 205, *an*; l. 230, *mi*; l. 278, *sulicas*; l. 289, *men*; l. 312, *giuuilic*; l. 315, *biueng*; l. 324, *sô*; l. 326, *Sodomo*; l. 327, *hêuandage.* In the footnotes read: p. 236, l. 5, *10* instead of *20*; p. 244, l. 12, *uuarathe*; p. 247, l. 6, *bihueng.*

EDWARD H. SEHRT.

Gettysburg College.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

Joseph Joubert: *Letters à Mme de Vintimille,* ed. by André Beaunier. Paris, Devambez. N. D. xlvi + 90 pp.

The importance of this collection, from the point of view of scholarship, consists not in the quantity—with Joubert one rarely thinks in terms of quantity—but in the quality of the fresh material. There are thirty-four letters; twelve now appear for the first time and four of the others are now first published in their correct form. The evident fidelity of the transcription would have pleased the late Abbé Pailhès, who in his *Du Nouveau sur Joubert*[1] was so distressed at the mutilation of the latter's *Correspondance.* M. Beaunier adds sufficiently copious annotations (Raynal's earlier edition of the *Correspondance* has none) and a preface of some forty pages in which, with the aid chiefly of documents from the Archives Nationales, he writes of the "life and death of Louise Joséphine Angélique de Vintimille, whom Joubert tenderly loved."

The new letters vary greatly in interest. Some of them are merely notes or fragments, others—altho it is hard ever to think of Joubert as writing without distinction—are at least not revealing. There is no new light on Chateaubriand or others of Joubert's literary intimates, and this is a disappointment to those who remember Joubert's shrewd analysis of "le pauvre garçon," so useful to Sainte-Beuve in the latter's study of the author of *René.* One could have wished for some evidence as to the *Pensées* attributed to Chateaubriand and probably from the hand of Joubert.[2] But M. Beaunier is not responsible for such lacunae. On the other hand letters IX, X, XIII, and especially XII, are in high degree personal, and since, as M. Beaunier has remarked in an earlier book on Joubert, "son chef d'œuvre, c'est lui," this evidence is precious. We have here further illuminating examples of the exquisite and sometimes slightly pathological sensibility of the man and also of the poise which, in spite of much danger of disequilibration, he achieved. This is particularly true of the letter of January 28, 1815, beginning: "Je vais mal, mais non pas tristement."

The preface is worthy of the subject. Joubert's literary fate has been a singular one. He printed nothing over his own name in

[1] Paris, Garnier, 1900.

[2] Cf. Masson, *Chateaubriand et Joubert,* in *RHL,* 1909, pp. 794-797.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

his life-time, craving not publicity but perfection, and altho his literary sponsors after his death were Chateaubriand and Sainte-Beuve, he was hardly known in France until a reference in *le Monde où l'on s'ennuie* made the public aware of "le philosophe Joubert." Esoteric, he is not such a writer as could ever be successfully broadcasted, but fine tributes to his exquisite quality, such as Matthew Arnold's and Professor Babbitt's, are not lacking, and more recently we have M. Beaunier's two studies of *la Jeunesse de Joubert*[3] and of *Joubert et la Révolution*[3] now supplemented by the present account of his relations with Mme de Vintimille. Quotations from Joubert adorn any book, and inspire at once fine writing. M. Beaunier in the present work—without impugning his intrinsic merit—is no exception; his book is not only documented with the competence of a specialist but composed with a delicacy which places it in the best Joubert tradition.[4]

Amherst College. HORATIO E. SMITH.

CORRESPONDENCE

SHAKESPEARE AND GREENE'S *Orlando Furioso*

The debt of *As You Like It* to Greene's *Orlando Furioso* for Orlando's name and for the device of hanging (not engraving) roundelays on trees has been recognized, but perhaps another point may be made regarding a relationship between the two works. Rosalind (Act III, scene 2) tells Orlando that she has often heard her "old religious uncle read many lectures against love," and she says, "I thank God I am not a woman, to be touch'd with so many giddy offences as he hath generally tax'd their whole sex withal.

Orl. Can you remember any of the principal evils that he laid to the charge of women?

Ros. There were none principal; they were all like one another as half-pence are, every one fault seeming monstrous till his fellow-fault came to match it.

. . . .

[3] Paris, Perrin, 1918.

[4] The beautiful printing of the book is marred by a few errors. We have noticed: p. xli, *eette*, read *cette;* p. 7, *eouleur*, read *couleur;* p. 39, *hydromélanophohie*, read *hydromélanophobie*.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

Ros. Love is merely a madness, and, I tell you, deserves as well a dark house and a whip as madmen do; and the reason why they are not so punished and cured is, that the lunacy is so ordinary that the whippers are in love too. Yet I profess curing it by counsel.

Orl. Did you ever cure any so?

Ros. Yes, one, and in this manner. He was to imagine me his love, his mistress, and I set him every day to woo me; at which time would I, being but a moonish youth, grieve, be effeminate, changeable, longing and liking, proud, fantastical, apish, shallow, inconstant, full of tears, full of smiles; for every passion something and for no passion truly any thing, as boys and women are for the most part cattle of this colour; would now like him, now loathe him; then entertain him; then forswear him; now weep for him, then spit at him; that I drave my suitor from his mad humour of love to a living humour of madness" etc.

To suggest that Shakespeare may have been indebted to any one source for Rosalind's satire at her own expense would be to forget that satire on women has sprung eternal in the manly breast. The literature of the subject is voluminous. Shakespeare knew both *The Romaunt of the Rose,* and Chaucer, whose playful irony is most like Shakespeare's and whose succinct expression is unequalled. "Mulier est hominis confusio" sums up the whole matter and is interpreted by Chaunticleer (if not literally at least *faithfully*) as "Womman is mannes Ioye and al his blis."

Greene's verses, drawn in part from Ariosto, seem to have something in common with Shakespeare's presentation of the old theme, and may have given to Shakespeare's imagination the suggestion he developed:

Foemineum servile genus, crudele, superbum:
Discourteous women, nature's fairest ill,
The woe of man, that first-created curse.
Base female sex, sprung from black Ate's loins,
Proud, disdainful, cruel, and unjust,
Whose words are shaded with enchanting wiles,
Worse than Medusa mateth all our minds;
And in their hearts sits shameless treachery,
Turning a truthless vile circumference.
O, could my fury paint their furies forth!
For hell's no hell, comparèd to their hearts,
Too simple devils to conceal their arts;
Born to be plagues unto the thoughts of men,
Brought for eternal pestilence to the world.

O femminile ingegno, di tutti mali sede,
Come ti volgi e muti facilmente,
Contrario oggetto proprio de la fede!
O infelice, O miser chi ti crede!

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

Importune, superbe, dispettose,
Prive d'amor, di fede e di consiglio,
Timerarie, crudeli, inique, ingrate,
Per pestilenzia eterna al mondo nate.
Orlando Furioso, Act II, Scene I.

The fact that this passage occurs in the pastoral portion of *Orlando Furioso*, and is spoken by Orlando in the madness caused by his doubt of Angelica's fidelity creates a presumption in favor of the view that Shakespeare was inspired by Greene to introduce this topic into the dialogue between Ganymede and "love-shak'd" Orlando. Ganymede's allusions to madness seem to confirm the supposition.

MARTHA HALE SHACKFORD.
Wellesley College.

THE PROSE OF OCCLEVE'S *Lerne to Dye*

Furnivall's marginal summary of the last three stanzas of Occleve's *Lerne to Dye* reads as follows: "The other 3 parts of this treatise [i. e., a chapter in Henry Suso's *Horologium Sapientiae* [1]], I'm too great a fool to english in rhyme, so I'll do it in prose, and tell of the joys of the heavenly city, Jerusalem." [2] But in lines 925-931 Occleve says, a bit ambiguously, to be sure, that he will conclude the poem by translating into prose the Ninth Lesson for All Hallows' Day. Furnivall's summary obscures the change in sources from Suso to the Breviary. As a matter of fact, moreover, the change is made before the prose begins. The last stanza is itself a paraphrase from the Latin:

How greet ioie and blisse is shapen to hem
þat so shuln passe hens vp to the Citee
Callid celestial, Ierusalem.
Aftir our might and possibilitee
Let vs considere al thogh it so be,
That for to comprehende þat gladnesse,
Verraily no wit may, ne tonge expresse.

Consideremus ergo inclitam urbis illius felicitatem, in quantum considerare possible est. Ut enim vere est: comprehendere nullus sermo sufficiet.

The Latin passage consists of the fourth and fifth sentences of the Ninth Lesson for the first of November in the Sarum Breviary.[3] With the sixth sentence, Dicitur de ea in quodam loco sic, etc., Occleve begins his prose,[4] following the Lesson sentence by sentence, almost verbally, but adding tautological words or phrases (not for the purpose of alliteration) after the fashion he had used in trans-

[1] See Kurtz, *M. L. N.* XXXVIII, 337-339.
[2] *EETS. ES.* LXI, 212.
[3] F. Procter and C. Wordsworth, Breviarum ad usum insignis ecclesiae Sarum. III, 976 (3 vols. Univ. Camb. Press, 1879-1886).
[4] *EETS. ES.* LXI, 213-215.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

lating Suso's *Horologium* into the rhyme-royals of the poem proper. An example or two from the prose will illustrate this inveterate habit. The additions are printed in italics.

. . . there is no brennynge *or hete* of couetyse.	. . . cupiditas nulla exardescit.
. . . ioieful yiftes *and iocunde* of immortalitee; there shal neuere be discord, *stryf, ne debat.*	. . . immortalitatis munera jocunda. Nulla erit tunc usquam discordia.
. . . there is an excellent brightnesse *and shynynge.*	Jugis splendor.
. . . ne þerte can thynke *ne comprehende.*	. . . nec in cor hominis ascendit.
. . . ne miserie *or wrecchidnesse* of age.	. . . nec senectutis miseria.

For the last sentence in the fourth paragraph of Furnivall's arrangement of the prose (p. 215) and for all of the fifth (last) paragraph there is no corresponding Latin either in Procter and Wordsworth's text of the Ninth Lesson or in the source whence the Lesson derives. The last paragraph, judging from the slovenly way in which it pictures the pains of Hell by suggesting that they are the opposites of the pleasures of the New Jerusalem as just described, we may surmise to be Occleve's invention.

The source of the Lesson is part of a sermon that has been attributed to St. Augustine (so the Sarum Breviary), to Bede (so the Tridentine Breviary of the Roman Rite), and to others;[5] but both the Sarum and the Roman breviaries omit matter at the middle of the extract, the Sarum about 20 lines, the Roman about 37. Occleve has all of the Sarum Lesson (i. e., as given in the text noted, the 1531 ed. of the Great Breviary), which includes some of the material missing in the Tridentine excerpt. It is clear, of course, that he followed, as he naturally would, the Sarum Use. But from the agreement of his translation with certain variants given by Procter and Wordsworth, it may be inferred that he had before him a text substantially identical with that of the Great Legenda noted by the editors as *Leg. Joh. Cantab. MSS.*

BENJAMIN P. KURTZ.

University of California.

[5] St. Augustine, Opera Omnia, Benedictine ed., v. Pars Altera (Paris, 1838), col. 2888 ff., being No. 209 of the sermons attributed to St. Aug.,—in older editions it is listed as De Sanctis 37; Bede, Migne, Patrol. Lat., xciv, col. 450 ff. See the Benedictine footnote for the sources of the sermon and those to whom it has been attributed. In the Roman Breviary, the extract in question begins in the Fifth Lesson for November second (All Souls' Day).

Digitized by Google   Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

A Paragraph Deleted by Coleridge

Although Dowden and Brandl lend their authority to such a view, no one who has read the documents in the case will for an instant take as exact historic truth those asseverations of Coleridge that he was never a Jacobin,[1] nor believed *vox populi* to be *vox Dei.*[2] Moreover Mr. Walter Graham has recently[3] given final proofs in the matter. One bit of evidence, however, appears to have hitherto escaped. Since it not only confirms the view that Coleridge was once extreme in his doctrine but also shows that he himself was as late as 1818 aware that he had been so, I note it here.

To prove his freedom from the Jacobinical taint, Coleridge in 1815 (the probable date of writing of the passage in *Biographia Literaria*) refers to the original *Friend,* numbers 10 and 11, dealing with Cartwright's doctrine. Upon this testimony he should have been acquitted in 1809-10. But contemporary criticism probably continued, stressing earlier delinquencies, for when Coleridge found himself at work in the 1818 rifacimento of *The Friend* he felt the necessity of going back to earlier evidence. Accordingly he reprinted the first of the *Conciones ad Populum*[4] as Essay XVI, Section I, explaining, "The only omissions regard the names of persons."[5] No one has, so far as I can discover, noted that in addition to names he omitted in the reprint the following paragraph, near the end of the address.[6] He is speaking, *viva voce,* to the rich and powerful.

. . . Renounce then the proud pretensions of democracy; do not profess Tenets which it is impossible for you surrounded by all the symbols of superiority to wish realized. But you plead, it seems, for equalization of *Rights,* not of *Condition.* O mockery! All that can delight the poor man's senses or strengthen his understanding, you preclude; yet with generous condescension you would bid him exclaim "Liberty and Equality!" because, forsooth he should possess the same *Right* to an Hovel which you claim to a Palace. This the laws have already given. And what more do *you* promise?

[1] *The Complete Works of Samuel Taylor Coleridge*, New York, 1884, III, 282; II, 203, 296.

[2] *Ibid.*, VI, 393.

[3] *PMLA*. XXXVI, 61-64 (March, 1921).

[4] Delivered at Bristol, February 1795.

[5] *Complete Works*, II, 296; *The Friend*, London, 1818, vol. II, p. 241. Coleridge omitted also, however, the whole of the first paragraph (which contains no names) and two paragraphs following the quotation from Akenside (the former of which names Joseph Gerald) including ten quatrains *To the Exiled Patriots.*

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

Beyond question it was upon this passage that his critics based, in part at least, their "infamous libel in proof of my former Jacobinism." [5] And Samuel Taylor Coleridge, reprinting the almost vanished pamphlet, deleted the passage to prove the libel.

B. H. LEHMAN.

University of California.

BRIEF MENTION

William Wordsworth, his Doctrine and Art in their Historical Relations. By Arthur Beatty, Associate Professor of English (University of Wisconsin Studies in Language and Literature, Number 17. Madison, 1923. 284 pp.). Dr. Beatty knows as well as anyone can know that to add another to the critical treatises on Wordsworth does not give the surest promise of an eager greeting by the more serious portion of the reading public. The subject seems to offer too little that is not already well expounded. It is, therefore, of first importance to allow Dr. Beatty to define the purpose of his book, briefly indicated in its title: "This study deals mainly with the mature theories and poetry of Wordsworth: that is, with the period beginning with the year 1798 and extending to the end of his active career. However, since I regard Wordsworth's doctrine and art as a developing unity and explain that unity by making as clear as possible how the later forms develop out of the earlier, sufficient attention has been paid to the earlier period of his career to make this development intelligible. The carrying out of this design has led to a somewhat detailed study of some of his long poems which have suffered comparative neglect on the part of critics, such as *The Excursion, The River Duddon,* and *The White Doe of Rylstone,* with a closer examination than has hitherto been attempted of the relationship of his mature theories to his actual poetical performance. This attempt to unify and harmonize two aspects of Wordsworth which are frequently regarded as hostile may fairly be put forward as a claim by this volume to a distinct place in Wordsworth criticism."

But assurance is given that the validity of the 'claim put forward' is further sustained by a hope that the study bestowed on the poet's prose will yield "important results." There has been

[5] *Conciones ad Populum,* [Bristol] 1795, p. 32. Professor Shedd in his edition, New York 1884, says of the reprint in *The Friend,* "In this edition the author has made some alterations, but they are confined to the mere style." *Complete Works,* II, 297, footnote.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

gross oversight in this matter, for "it remains true that never before have some of the central passages of this *Preface* [of 1800, and as enlarged in 1802] been even commented upon. The same rather surprising thing is true of the *Letter* to 'Mathetes'; and also of the *Preface* of 1815. Furthermore, the prose-writings have never been seriously studied as an integral part of the poet's expression supplementary to the poetry and essential to any evaluation of his work as a writer. This serious defect in Wordsworth criticism it is the aim of this book to correct." But this is not all. Something remains to be done for the solution of æsthetic and critical problems by connecting the poet's "intentions and methods" with the English philosophy of his day. This will enable us to see more clearly "why he approached his theories by way of associationism, and discussed them in such terms as nature, emotion, imagination, fancy, activity, power, reason, and so on." A new way is also thus disclosed "of studying the relationship between Wordsworth and his contemporary poets." But the "Preface" which has thus far been reported must not be dismissed from close attention before Dr. Beatty be allowed to describe his attitude of mind in this study. He will not be controversial, nor a special advocate; the art and thought of the poet will be presented to the unbiased understanding thru the "calm and deliberate statements" of the poet himself, "because they need no defense if they are understood. I have consistently taken the attitude that an earnest attempt to understand is to be regarded as the best and only defense of this great poet. In every case where I have acted as the interpreter of the poet's thought and art, I have done my best . . . . to couch my explanation in his language."

Dr. Beatty has strong convictions respecting the failure of critics to find the true approach to the poet. Their false or imperfect methods are reviewed in his first chapter. Arnold is seriously in error because of his failure to perceive the intellectual and philosophic aspects of the poet's thought and art. He has had a strong following in the practice of ignoring the critical value of the poet's prose-writings. Mr. Herford ignores chronology, and contributes to the erroneous view that the poet has had no traceable 'development.' Pater and Bradley are wrong in assigning to German rather than to English philosophy interpretative value. This inherently denies the fact that German philosophy developed from Locke and Hume. "I hope to show," says Dr. Beatty, "that Professor Bradley has failed to note the similarities and the spiritual kinship between Wordsworth and his English predecessors, and that he has failed to perceive that the poet is in the direct line of succession to the inheritance of their thought." The "fourth method of approach" to be corrected is represented, tho by each in his own way, by Professors Legouis and Babbitt. It over-estimates

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

the poet's debt to Rousseau, and consequently depresses his masterful "originality and distinctness." For the poet "in his reasoned expression, does not acquiesce, but revolts. He revolts against Rousseauism . . . . a reactionary in the fullest sense of the term, both in art and in his general theory of morals and conduct," he reverted in his reaction "toward those earlier authors and philosophers whose teachings and practice had been distorted by later practitioners." In a later chapter (VII) the poet's view of nature is shown to be based on reason, as in the tradition of the English philosophers, in contrast with the sentimentalism of Rousseau, whom indeed, as is incidentally observed, Wordsworth "contradicted openly and in a reasoned manner" (p. 17, note).

The exaltation of reason as the guide in life and art is the key-note of his reaction to the formative influences discussed in a chapter on the "Early Theory of Life and Politics—Relation to Godwin," followed by another, entitled "Early Theory of Art—Relation to the School of Taste." These are important chapters, for in the words of the author, "Godwin taught him [the poet] to generalize about politics, society, ethics, and matters of conduct; the various authors of the school of taste taught him to generalize about art." One must regret that the points of Dr. Beatty's clear discussion in these chapters cannot be even completely enumerated in this brief notice. The teachings of Godwin, relating chiefly to the supremacy of reason in social and political theory, to humanitarianism, democracy, denunciation of autocracy and militarism, are dominant in the poet's attitude of mind to the year 1795 (witness the Juvenal-project, *Guilt and Sorrow, The Borderers*); thereafter, "the general stock of English thought, especially the stock of English philosophic thought as expressed in the system of David Hartley and the writings of other adherents of the school of taste give a new direction to his development."

Three leading tenets of the school of taste are reviewed with reference to the poet's reaction to them: (1) "taste is acquired by the study of the masters of art"; (2) uniformity with variety is required; (3) the association of ideas. This last is "the most important in considering the mature Wordsworth. The doctrine of taste and imitation" loses its specific features after 1798; and soon after 1800 "the doctrine of uniformity and variety was allowed to drop into comparative obscurity." But "the doctrine of association became an essential part of his most mature doctrine." It becomes more profound thru the study of the philosophers; "in the light of Hartley's interpretation" of it the poet "furnishes a new and original theory of Nature, of Fancy, and of Imagination, and becomes at once the interpreter and poet of associationism."

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

In the next chapter Dr. Beatty, with admirable composure and philosophic breadth of method, surveys the problem that has suffered perversion at the hands of critics,—the problem of the poet's disapproval of "poetic diction" and arguments in favor of "the real language of men." The poet himself knew that he was not "fighting a battle without enemies" in this cause, for "a practical faith" in his opinions was "almost unknown."

The poet's theory of the unity of the mind thru childhood, youth, and maturity, the mystery of personal identity and of unbroken consciousness thru a long life, this "forms the basis of all his other ideas and is the point of approach to all the other main problems of ethics, art, and politics with which he deals in his poetry and prose." This is the subject of a chapter on "The Three Ages of Man." It is shown that probably the conception of the theory preceded the poet's beginning the *Recluse* (1797), and it is set forth in *Tinturn* (1798), in which the poet "presents the history of his mind's development as a tripartite thing, as it were; divided into three distinct stages or periods; each marked by its distinct attitude to the universe of man and nature." This poem "is therefore the forerunner of the *Prelude*"; but it is more than that because of its being the first expressing this most "fundamental" theory regarding "life and poetry," and from which he drew "his famous distinction between Fancy and Imagination." Dr. Beatty traces thru a long chapter, abounding in valuable comments, the range of this theory in the poet's writings. The great *Ode* is interpreted in a sense that the author declares to be "not by any means the usual one"; and the neglected reply of the poet to "Mathetes" receives adequate attention. The poet's arguments here attain the new clearness with an added pedagogic value. The educationist should study this reply, and Dr. Beatty will be heartily thanked for restoring it to wider notice in its philosophic connections.

Between 1795 and 1798 Wordsworth, revolting from Godwin and 'poetic diction,' acquires the philosophy and the æsthetic which are characteristic of him. The influences under which this step in his development was taken are considered in several chapters that now follow. The first of these concerns the poet's relation to Hartley and English Philosophy. Dr. Beatty's previous contribution on this subject (p. 95, note) proved his preparation for this excellent chapter, which, with this general commendation, must be dismissed from detailed notice at this time. So too the following discussion of the poet's "Doctrine of Nature" must be slighted. "The poet deals with Nature in terms of his own peculiar theory of the development of the mind, that is, in terms of the three ages of man"; each age has its peculiar relation to 'nature'; "what he holds true of one period he does not regard as true of the

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

others" (p. 121). In his view of 'nature' he is not a disciple of Rousseau. These philosophic chapters are somewhat discursive, tho the author can not be accused of an attempt to "make intricate seem straight." This 'doctrinal' portion of the book culminates in two chapters dealing with the Imagination and Fancy (pp. 137-169). It is the culmination of the coherent method presented for the study of the poet, which regards him "possessed of more than usual organic sensibility" (these are his own words, pp. 152, 160) and of a truly philosophic mind. To reach forward from this point to the conclusion of the whole matter, the method corrects the criticism that rests in the vague admission of a philosophic poet and ignores his definite philosophy, which is revealed thru the combined study of his prose and poetry. Wordsworth is "a philosophic poet not merely in the general sense of a contemplative or meditative poet, but a philosophic poet who expresses a distinctive philosophy . . . . he is the poet of the English philosophy of Locke and his school in general, and of the English associationistic philosophy in particular" (p. 272).

The adopted philosophy so insistently maintained in the doctrine of the "three ages," places Fancy and Imagination respectively at the beginning and the end of the mind's normal development. The first is based on earliest sensations; the second is the handmaid of reasoned knowledge. Both are activities of the mind, not passive experiences. So too is Taste an activity of the mind, by which the products of the creative imagination are appreciated (pp. 152, 233). Fancy is youthful, untrue to fact, and melancholy; the Imagination is the mature and hopeful power of recombining "the truth of fact and of life" into the "forms of creative art in accordance with Truth and right Reason" (p. 157).

Preceding the "Conclusion" are three chapters in which Dr. Beatty applies his method or theory of interpretations and selected points in (1) "The Shorter Poems"; (2) "The Philosophic Poem: *The Prelude* and Personal Readjustment"; (3) "The Philosophic Poem: *The Excursion* and Reconstruction." This is in extent a third of the book (pp. 173-271), and will be especially valued both for minuter points of interpretation and for a masterly presentation of the poet's comprehensive views of truth and art as exhibited in the plan and purpose of his poems. The discussion of these topics is rightly begun by an interpretation of the poet's classification of his minor poems, "the little cells, oratories, and sepulchral recesses" of the "gothic church." Close attention to this matter refutes the jest of critics in discerning the subject of *The Idiot Boy* to be "mother-love in its most absolute form" (p. 184). In like manner fresh interest is aroused at a number of points, of which only a few can be named here. Among the *Lyrical*

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

Ballads is distinguished a group of anti-Godwinian poems. Thus, in the *Anecdote for Fathers* there is an intrusion "into the unthinking mind of the child" of adult processes of reason and thought. In the poems grouped with *The Tables Turned* is represented the associationist doctrine of "The ties | That bind the perishable hours of life" (p. 150) into unity of consciousness and in the process of the growth of knowledge (p. 190). *Ruth* and *Peter Bell* are released from imputed mysticism or unnaturalism and restored to conformity with the adopted philosophy of the effects of experience and of reaction to nature. Very characteristic of the poet's method is *To the Cuckoo,* in its variation from the original it becomes "the opening movement, as it were, of an Ode on the Three Ages, and is the thought actually expressed in *Tintern Abbey,* the *Ode,* and the first two books of *The Prelude*" (p. 197). There is admirable comment on the sequence of sonnets on *The River Duddon;* it "identifies itself with the great philosophic poem: as a worthy 'adjunct,' in accordance with the poet's complete design of his work as a poet" (p. 200). It might have been added here that the symbol of a stream, figuring growth and development, was in the mind of the poet when planning the *Ecclesiastical Sonnets.*

That the poet from the first had conceived his characteristic design of a philosophic unit embracing all his poems is shown by his letters chiefly. This evidence of the early beginning of *The Prelude* and the gradual development of the plan of *The Recluse* is admirably presented by Dr. Beatty. An important conclusion is reached: "*The Prelude* must not be viewed as a biography. . . . Its structure is not at all chronological in the strict sense of the term, for the matter is arranged in accordance with a systematic explanation of the development of the mind of the individual. . . . *The Prelude* is at bottom philosophical in method" (p. 212). It is a personal record of how "one person attained to true knowledge, ... illustrated with an abundance of detail . . . . and fullness of explanation that make the poem a unique document in literature. This I call personal readjustment. The more general aspect of the question is found in *The Excursion,* in the form of a discussion of the way in which the despondency of the age can be changed to hope through the attainment of knowledge. This I call reconstruction, social and political" (p. 216).

With the author's indicated key-note of the closing discussion, this notice must be abruptly ended. The inadequacy of this notice will not, it is hoped, be construed to mean less than a complete conviction that Dr. Beatty has made a valid contribution to the right method of appreciating and interpreting the great poet.

J. W. B.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

RECENT PUBLICATIONS

ENGLISH

Attenborough, F. L.—The Laws of the Earliest English Kings, Edited and Translated. *Cambridge:* University Press, 1922. 256 pp.

Austin, Mary.—The American Rhythm. *New York:* Harcourt, Brace and Co., 1923. 155 pp.

Belloc, H.—The Old Road. *New York:* E. P. Dutton & Co., 1923.

Blickensderfer, Joseph Patrick.—"One Impulse from a Vernal Wood." Reprinted from *Washington University Studies*, Vol. x, Humanistic Series, No. 1, pp. 155-164, 1922.

Bradley, H. and Bridges, R. — On the Terms Briton, British, Britisher. [With] Preposition at End, by H. W. Fowler. S. P. E. Tract XIV. *Oxford:* Clarendon Press, 1923.

Carlyle, Alexander.—Letters of Thomas Carlyle to John Stuart Mill, John Sterling, and Robert Browning. *London:* Fisher Unwin, 1923. 312 pp. 25s.

Chevalley, Abel.—Le Roman Anglais de notre temps. *London:* Humphrey Milford, 1921. 256 pp.

Egan, Rose Frances.—The Genesis of the Theory of 'Art for Art's Sake' in Germany and in England. Smith College *Studies in Modern Languages*, Vol. II, No. 4.

Ekwall, Eilert.—English Place-Names in *-Ing. Lund:* C. W. K. Gleerup; *London:* Humphrey Milford, 1923.

Fagin, N. Bryllion.—Short Story Writing. *New York:* Thomas Seltzer, 1923. $1.50.

Faries, Randolph.—Ancient Rome in the English Novel. *Philadelphia:* University of Pennsylvania, 1923.

Fowler, J. H. — De Quincey as Literary Critic. [The English Association, Pamphlet No. 52.] *New York:* Oxford University Press, 1922. 18 pp. 70 cts.

Garrod, H. W.—Wordsworth. *New York:* Oxford University Press, 1923. $2.50.

Gepp, Edward. — A Contribution to an Essex Dialect Dictionary (Supplement III). [Reprinted from the "Essex Review," April, 1922.] *Colchester:* Benham and Co., 1922.

Hamelius, P. — Mandeville's Travels. Translated from the French of Jean d'Outremeuse. Vol. II., Introduction and Notes. Early English Text Society, Original Series, No. 154. *London:* Humphrey Milford, 1923.

Haney, John Louis.—The Story of Our Literature, An Interpretation of the American Spirit. *New York:* Charles Scribner's Sons, 1923. 399 pp.

Jesperson, Otto.—Growth and Structure of the English Language. 4th edition. *New York:* D. Appleton and Co., 1923.

Lee, Sidney and Boas, F. S.—The Year's Work in English Studies, 1920-1. *London:* Oxford University Press, Humphrey Milford, 1922. 192 pp. $2.50.

Mackenzie, W. Roy.—Hamlet as a Man of Action. Reprinted from Washington University Studies, Volume x, Humanistic Series, No. 1, pp. 103-141, 1922.

Malory, Sir Thomas.—Le Mort D'Arthur. 2 volumes. *London:* Jonathan Cape, 1923. 25s.

Mantle, Burns.—The Best Plays of 1922-1923, and The Year Book of the Drama in America. *Boston:* Small, Maynard Company, 1923. $2.00.

Parrott, T. M.—The Problem of Timon of Athens. [The Shakespeare Association.] *London:* H. Milford, 1923.

Paues, A. C. — Bibliography of English Language and Literature 1922. Edited for the Modern Humanities Research Association. *Cambridge:* Bowes and Bowes, 1923.

Rollins, Hyder E.—Cavalier and Puritan. Ballads and Broadsides Illustrating the Period of the Great Rebellion, 1640-1660. *New York:* The New York University Press, 1923. 531 pp.

Schelling, Felix E.—Foreign Influences in Elisabethan Plays. *New York:* Harper and Brothers, 1923.

Shelton, Thomas. — The History of Don Quixote of the Mancha. Translated from the Spanish of Miguel de Cervantes. Reprinted from the first edition, 1612-1620. With a new preface by F. J. Harvey Daton. *London:* Navare Society, 1923. £3, 3s.

Spittal, John Ker.—Contemporary Criticisms of Dr. Samuel Johnson. His Works and His Biographers. *London:* Murray, 1923. 412 pp. 16s.

Sutcliffe, Emerson Grant. — Emerson's Theories of Literary Expressions. *Urbana, Illinois:* University of Illinois Press, 1923. 152 pp. $1.50.

Thomson, William. — The Rhythm of Speech. *Glasgow:* University Press, 1923. £5, 5s.

Tillyard, E. M. W. — Lamb's Criticism. *New York:* The Macmillan Co., 1923.

Waterhouse, Francis A.—Random Studies in the Romantic Chaos. *New York:* Robert M. McBride & Co., 1923. $2.50.

Wells, Carolyn.—An Outline of Humor. *New York:* G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1923. $5.00.

Wells, John Edwin.—Second Supplement to A Manual of the Writings in Middle English, 1050-1400. *New Haven:* Yale University Press, 1923.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

GERMAN

Aster, E. v. — Goethes Faust. [Philos. Reihe. Bd. 75.] *München:* Rösl & Cie., 1923. 157 pp.

Bartsch, Karl.—Untersuchungen zur Jenaer Liederhandschrift. [Palaestra. 140.]. *Leipzig:* Mayer & Müller, 1923. iv + 112 pp. M. 5.

Chiquot, A.—Histoire ou légende. Jean Tauler et le "Meisters buoch." Diss. *Strassbourg:* 1923. xvi + 214 pp.

Dam, Jan van. — Zur Vorgeschichte des höfischen Epos. Lamprecht, Eilhart, Veldeke [Rhein. Beiträge u. Hülfsbücher z. germ. Phil. u. Volkskunde. Bd. 8]. *Bonn u. Leipzig:* K. Schroeder, 1923. xv + 132 pp.

Ehlers, Karl.—Die Bühnenbearbeitungen von Schillers "Don Karlos" in Prosa. [Germanische Studien. H. 26]. *Berlin:* Ebering, 1923. 64 pp.

Farinelli, A.—Il romantismo in Germania. 2a ed. riveduta e largamente ritoccata. *Bari:* Laterza, 1923. x + 190 pp. L. 12.50.

Goedeke, Karl.—Grundriss zur Geschichte der deutschen Dichtung aus den Quellen. 2. Aufl. H. 32 [= Bd. 12, Bogen 12-21]. *Dresden:* L. Ehlermann, 1923. Pp. 177-336.

Gierach, Erich. — Altdeutsche Namen in den Sudetenländern. *Reichenberg i. B.:* F. Kraus, 1923. 19 pp.

Heise, Wilh.—Gerhart Hauptmann. Die klassischen Dramen des deutschen Naturalismus. Die Weber, Fuhrmann Henschel, Rose Bernd. [Universal-Bibliothek Nr. 6413]. *Leipzig:* Ph. Reclam jun. [1923]. 68 pp.

Klinghardt, H.—Sprechmelodie und Sprechtakt. *Marburg i. H.:* Elwert, 1923. 31 pp.

Lach, Rob. — Eine Tiroler Liederhs. aus dem 18. Jh. [Akad. d. Wiss. Philos.-hist. Kl., Sitzungsber. Bd. 198, Abh. 5]. *Wien u. Leipzig:* Hölder-Pichler-Tempsky, 1923. 62 pp.

Mann, Thomas. — Goethe und Tolstoi. Vortrag. *Aachen u. Leipzig:* F. Wagner, 1923. 48 pp.

May, Kurt.—Lessings u. Herders kunsttheoretische Gedanken in ihrem Zusammenhang. [Germanische Studien. H. 25.] *Berlin:* Ebering, 1923. 159 pp. M. 4.40.

Naumann, Hans.—Jüngste deutsche Dichtung. 2. Aufl. *Jena:* Frommann, 1923. 20 pp.

Pauker, Wolfgang.—Lenaus Freundin Nanette Wolf in Gmunden. *Wien u. Leipzig:* Dr. Strohmer, 1923. 198 pp.

Regler, Gustav. — Die Ironie im Werk Goethes. *Leipzig:* B. Dietze [1923]. 80 pp. M. 4.

Scheiner, Andreas. — Die Mundart der Burzenländer Sachsen. Mit Karte u. Übersichtstafel. [Deu. Dialektgeographie. H. 18]. *Marburg:* Elwert, 1922. xi + 196 pp. M. 4.50.

Tarneller, Josef.—Zur Namenkunde. 1. Tiroler Familiennamen. 4000 Geschlechtsnamen, die tirolischen u. vorarlbergischen Hofnamen entsprossen sind. *Bozen:* Buchhandlung Tyrolia, 1923. 210 pp. L. 12.

Ulmann, Hanns. — Das deutsche Bürgertum in deutschen Tragödien des 18. u. 19. Jhdts. [Diss. Giessen]. *Elberfeld:* Hofbauer, 1923. 74 pp. M. 1.

Walbrach Carl.—Joh. Georg. Schlosser und sein Anteil an den Vorarbeiten zum Fürstenbund. [Monogr. z. Gesch. d. Goethe-Zeit u. d. Goethe-Kreises 2.]. *Giessen:* Ferber, 1923. 64 pp. M. 4.

Zallinger, Otto. — Die Eheschliessungen im Nibelungenlied und in der Gudrun. [Akad. d. Wiss. in Wien, Philos.-hist. Kl., Sitzungsber. Bd. 199, Abh. 1]. *Wien u. Leipzig:* Hölder-Pichler-Tempsky, 1923. 68 pp.

FRENCH

Allard, L. — La Comédie de moeurs en France au dix-neuvième siècle I, de Picard à Scribe. *Cambridge:* Harvard Press, 1923. xii + 492 pp.

Albarel, P.—Quelques aperçus nouveaux sur la Bibl. Saint-Victor. *Narbonne:* Brieu, 1922.

Bordeaux, H.—La Maison, ed. by Cardon and Michell. *New York:* Heath, 1923. x + 284 pp. $1.12.

Cayrou, G.—Le français classique. Lexique de la langue du dix-septième siècle. *Paris:* Didier, 1923. xxviii + 888 pp.

Descartes. — Discours de la méthode. *Cambridge:* University Press, 1923. 74 pp. (Plain Texts.)

Dumas.—Les Trois Mousquetaires, ed. by V. E. François. *New York:* Allyn and Bacon, 1923. iv + 237 pp. 80 cts.

Duquesnel, F.—Souvenirs litt. G. Sand, Sainte-Beuve, Augier, Coppée, etc. *Paris:* Plon, 1922. iv + 304 pp. Fr. 7.

Fontenelle.—Eloges des savants, éd. par R. Peyre. *Paris:* Hatier (1922).

Hatzfeld, H.—J.-J. Rousseau. *Munich:* 1922.

Hellin, P. — Molière et Cyrano. *Paris:* Larousse, 1922.

Hess, J. A. — Games for French Clubs. *New York:* Heath, 1923. 11 pp.

Jéquier, W.—F. Brunetière et la crit. litt. (Lausanne Diss.) 1922. 154 pp.

Labiche, E.—Un jeune homme pressé, ed. by E. L. Lehman. *New York:* Holt, 1923. ix + 71 pp.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

Laborde-Milaa, A. — Un essayiste: E. Montégut. *Paris:* Maison du bibliophile, 1922. xiv + 346 pp. Fr. 20.

Levi, C. — Studi molierani. *Palermo:* Sandron, 1922.

Lavisse, E.—Histoire de France, ed. by Green and Vaillaut. *New York:* Heath, 1923. x + 373 pp. $1.52.

Leneru, M.—Saint-Just. *Paris:* Grasset, 1922.

Malakis, E.—Le Français du commerce. *New York:* Holt, 1923. viii + 219 pp.

Maloubier, E. F.—Au jour le jour. First year French reader and composition. *New York:* Heath, 1923. viii + 272 pp.

Nourrisson, P.—Trois précurseurs de la liberté d'association: Berryer, Montalembert, Lamartine. *Paris:* Sirey, 1922.

Pascal.—Lettres écrites à un provincial (I, IV, V, XIII). *Cambridge:* University Press, 1923. 64 pp. 1s. 3d. (Plain Texts.)

Poinsot, M.-C.—La Flamme de Chateaubriand. *Paris:* Pensée fr., 1922.

Rabelais.—Gargantua et Pantagruel, ed. by H. Clouzot. *Paris:* Crès, 1922.

Racine.—Lettres à son fils, ed. by G. Truc. *Paris:* Bossard, 1922.

Rivers, J.—Figaro; the life of Beaumarchais. *London:* Hutchinson, 1922.

Rudmose-Brown. — A Short History of French Literature. *Dublin:* Educational Co. of Ireland (1923). 192 pp.

Schinz, A.—Eighteenth Century Readings. *New York:* Holt, 1923. xiii + 633 pp.

Sgadari, E.—Saggio critico su la poesia di C. Baudelaire. *Catania:* Galàtola, 1921.

Stendhaliana.—Fasc. 1, 2, 3. *Grenoble:* Géniet, 1922.

Symons, A.—C. Baudelaire. *New York:* Dutton, 1922.

Vigny, de.—Cinq-Mars, pub. par F. Baldensperger. *Paris:* Conard, 1922.

Villon, Fr.—Œuvres, éd. critique par L. Thuasne. *Paris:* Picard, 1923. 3 vols. 1027 pp.

ITALIAN

Alighieri, Dante.—Il canzoniere. A cura di G. Zonta. *Torino:* Paravia, 1923. xv + 191 pp. L. 9. (Biblioteca di classici italiani.)

Ariosto, L. — Orlando furioso. *Firenze:* A. Salani, 1922. 2 vols., 636, 617 pp. L. 5.75. (I Classici. Edizione Florentia, ni. 3-4.)

Bandello, M. — Il canzoniere. Introduzione e note di F. Picco. *Torino:* Unione tipografico-editrice, 1923. 342 pp. L. 10. (Collezione di classici italiani con note, XII.)

Bellezza, P.—Curiosità manzoniane. *Milano:* A. Vallardi, 1923. 269 pp. L. 9.

Campanella, F.—Scritti letterari. *Teramo:* Tip. La Fiorita, 1923. 81 pp.

Chiocciola, G.—Il sugo politico dei Promessi Sposi. *Palermo:* Casa ed. "L'Attualità," 1923. 138 pp. L. 8.

Comune, F. E.—Vocaboli dialettali piemontesi d'un tempo (1400-1800), raccolti e commentati, con cenni storici e curiosità etimologiche, da —. *Sanremo:* Tip. Conti e Gandolfi, 1923. 70 pp.

Del Lungo I.—I tre canti di Sordello (Purg. VI, VII, VIII) commentati da —. Aggiuntovi il "Compianto di Sordello" e la figurazione trentina "Virgilio e Sordello" di Cesare Zocchi. *Firenze:* Le Monnier, 1923. 54 pp. L. 4.50.

Ercole, F.—Sulla genesi e sul contenuto del trattato della "Monarchia," di Dante. Introduzione ad una nuova traduzione con note di G. B. Siragusa. *Palermo:* R. Sandron, 1923. 95 pp.

Frittelli, U.—Si può rinfamar Sapìa? Chiosa dantesca. *Siena:* Tip. Lazzeri, 1922. 31 pp.

Garsia, A. — Il Magnifico e la rinascita. *Firenze:* L. Battistelli, 1923. xvi + 256 pp. L. 8.

Lucci, P.—Idilli del Leopardi. *Lanciano:* Tip. Masciangelo, 1923. 18 pp.

Manzoni, A.—Sentir messa. Libro della lingua italiana contemporaneo dei "Promessi Sposi," inedito. Introduzione e appendici critiche di D. Bulferetti. *Milano:* Bottega di poesia, 1923. 219 pp. L. 9.

Nappi, C. F.—Dizionario di vocaboli poco conosciuti della lingua italiana, con prefazione di Gennaro De Filippis (Dolores). *Napoli:* S. Romano, 1923. 84 pp. L. 3.

Ortiz, R.—Viaggio ai regni di Madonna Poesia. *Foligno:* F. Campitelli, 1923. 142 pp. L. 7.50.

Parodi, E. G.—Il dare e l'avere fra i pedanti e i geniali. *Napoli:* Soc. ed. F. Perrella, 1923. 118 pp. L. 7. (Biblioteca rara, terza serie, LI-LIV.)

Piccoli, V. — Itinerario leopardiano. *Milano:* Fratelli Treves, 1923. 221 pp. L. 9.

Reichenbach, G. — Un gentiluomo poeta del Quattrocento. Matteo Maria Boiardo. Parte I. *Ferrara:* Taddei, 1923. 106 pp. L. 6.

Sica, O.—Esposizione del canto XXVIII dell' Inferno. *Finalborgo:* Tip. V. Bolla e figlio, 1923. 35 pp.

Titta, C. De.—Nuove canzoni abruzzesi. *Lanciano:* R. Carabba, 1923. 184 pp. L. 5. (Collezione abruzzese.)

Ventura, Vincenzina. — Il teatro di Giacosa. *Palermo:* Tip. Corselli, 1922. 80 pp.

Zingarelli, N.—I figli di Dante. Discorso letto nella casa di Dante in Roma. *Firenze:* G. C. Sansoni, 1923. 35 pp. L. 3. (Lectura Dantis.)

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

SPANISH

Azorín.—Las confesiones de un pequeño filósofo. Edited with notes, exercises, and vocabulary by L. Imbert. With a critical introduction by F. de Onís. *Boston:* Heath, 1923. xv + 170 pp. 88 cts.

Berceo, Gonzalo de.—Milagros de Nuestra Señora. I. Edición y notas de A. G. Solalinde. *Madrid:* "La Lectura," 1922. xxxii + 211 pp. 5 pes. (Clásicos Castellanos, 44.)

Bolívar, Simón. — Address to the Venezuela Congress at Angostura, February 15, 1819. Introduction by F. A. Kirkpatrick. *Cambridge:* University Press, 1923. vii + 38 pp. (Cambridge Plain Texts.)

Escritoras españolas contemporáneas. *Madrid:* Perlado, Páez y Ca., 1922. 189 pp. (Biblioteca Universal, LVIII.)

Fernán Caballero.—Epistolario. Una colección de cartas inéditas de la novelista, publicada por A. López Argüello. *Barcelona:* J. Gili, 1922. 240 pp.

Givanel Mas, J.—El "Tirant lo Blanch" y "Don Quijote de la Mancha." *Barcelona:* Imp. de la Casa de Caritat, 1923. 78 pp. (Repr. fr. the "Quaderns d'Estudi," 1921-22.)

Jack, W. S. — The Early Entremés in Spain. The rise of a dramatic form. *Philadelphia:* The University of Pennsylvania, 1923. 136 pp. $2.00. (Publications of the University of Pennsylvania, Series in Romanic Languages and Literatures, No. 8.)

Krepinsky, M.—Inflexión de las vocales en español. Traducción y notas de V. García de Diego. *Madrid:* Sucs. de Hernando, 1923. 151 pp. 13 pes.

Larra, Mariano José de. — Artículos de costumbres. Prólogo y notas de J. R. Lomba y Pedraja. *Madrid:* "La Lectura," 1922. 326 pp. 5 pes. (Clásicos castellanos, 45.)

Martínez, G. — De paso por las bellas letras. Críticas y critiquillas. *Madrid:* Impr. del Asilo de Huérfanos del S. C. de Jesús, 1922. 2 vols., 362 and 349 pp.

Ortega y Gasset, J. — Personas, obras, cosas. . . *Madrid:* Artes de la Ilustración, 1922. 324 pp. 6 pes.

Ortiz de la Torre E. — Florilegio montañés. Antología de poetas líricos montañeses formada por —. *Santander:* J. Martínez, 1922. 279 pp. 5 pes.

Ramírez, R.—Elocuencia colombiana. Colección de discursos célebres de ilustres oradores colombianos, recopilados por —. *Bogotá:* 1921. 373 pp.

Saralegui, M. de. — Escarceos filológicos. Colección de artículos publicados en varias revistas. *Madrid:* Hijos de M. G. Hernández, 1922. viii + 329 pp.

ROMANCE

Esposito, Mario.—Mélanges philologiques. Textes et études de littérature ancienne et médiévale, premier fascicule. *Florence:* chez l'auteur, Via Nazionale, 10, 1921. 64 pp.

Seidel, A.—Einführung in das Studium d. rom. Sprachen. (A. Hartlebens Bibliothek d. Sprachenkunde, 131. Teil.) *Wien, Leipzig:* Hartleben. xvi + 176 pp.

Spitzer, L., ed.—Schuchardt-Brevier. Ein Vademekum der allgemeinen Sprachwissenschaft. Als Festgabe zum 80. Geburtstag des Meisters, zusammengestellt u. eingeleitet. *Halle:* Niemeyer, 1922. 375 pp. M. 60.

Zauner, Adolf.—Romanische Sprachwissenschaft I: Lautlehre u. Wortlehre I. 4., verbesserte Auflage. Sammlung Göschen, 128. 160 pp.

GENERAL

Abbott, F. F. — Roman Politics. [Our Debt to Greece and Rome.] *Boston:* Marshall Jones, 1923.

Burnet, John.—Ignorance. The Romanes Lecture, 1923. *New York:* Oxford University Press, American Branch, 1923. 70 cts.

Creizenach, Wilh. — Geschichte des neueren Dramas. Bd. 3: Renaissance u. Reformation. Tl. 2. Zweite verm. u. verb. Aufl. Bearb. u. mit einem vollst. Register zum 2. u. 3. Bd. versehen von Adalbert Hämel. *Halle:* Niemeyer, 1923. xv + 637 pp. M. 18.

Hermannsson, Halldór.—Icelandic Books of the 17th Century. [Islandica, an Annual relating to Iceland and the Fiske Icelandic Collection, Vol. 14]. *Ithaca, N. Y.:* Cornell Univ. Library, 1922. xiii + 121 pp. $2.00.

Jensen, Hans. — Neudänische Syntax. *Heidelberg:* Carl Winter, 1923. 183 pp.

Jóhannesson, Alex.—Grammatik der urnordischen Runeninschriften. [Germanische Bibliothek, 1. Abt. I. 11]. *Heidelberg:* Carl Winter, 1923. viii + 136 pp.

Malone, Kemp.—The Phonology of Modern Icelandic. [N. Y. Univ. Ottendorfer Memorial Series of Germanic Monographs No. 15]. *Menasha, Wis.:* George Banta, 1923. 137 pp.

von der Meer, M. J.—Grammatik der neuniederländischen Gemeinsprache (Het algemeen beschaafd). Mit Übungen u. Lesestücken von Marie Ramondt. *Heidelberg:* Carl Winter, 1923. xiv + 178 pp.

Kramer, Mary E.—One Thousand Literary Questions and Answers. *New York:* George Sully & Co., 1923. $1.50.

Rolfe, John C.—Cicero and His Influence. [Our Debt to Greece and Rome.] *Boston:* Marshall Jones, 1923.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

R. R. 2

Volume XXXIX FEBRUARY, 1924 Number 2

MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES

EDITED BY

JAMES WILSON BRIGHT, Editor-in-Chief

GUSTAV GRUENBAUM WILLIAM KURRELMEYER

H. CARRINGTON LANCASTER

CONTENTS

HASTINGS, W. S.—An unpublished Correspondence of Honoré de Balzac, 65

COOK, A. S.—'Beowulf' 1422, 77

BEATTY, J. M., JR.—Doctor Johnson and 'Mur,' 82

KNOWLTON, E. C.—Genius as an Allegorical Figure, 89

STORER, W. H.—Notes on Cyrano de Bergerac: A Mythical Translation of the 'Histoire Comique . . . de la Lune,' 96

CARTER, A. L.—Nietzsche on the Art of Writing, 98

Reviews:—

KUNO FRANCKE, Die Kulturwerte der Deutschen Literatur in Ihrer Geschichtlichen Entwicklung. Zweiter Band. [*A. B. Faust.*] 103

Recent French Text Books. [*R. C. Williams.*] 106

OLAV SKULERUD, Telemaalet i Umriss. [*G. T. Flom.*] 111

D. C. CABEEN, The African Novels of Louis Bertrand. [*R. P. Bowen.*] 115

Correspondence:—

PECK, W. E., Shelley's Reviews Written for the *Examiner*, 118

MUSTARD, W. P., Dante and Statius, 120

WALKER, A. S., A Sidelight on Shelley, 121

CAWLEY, R. R., "Areytos" in Sidney's *Defence of Poesy*, 121

McCUTCHEON, R. P., Dryden's Prologue to the *Prophetess*, 123

KAUFMAN, P., The Touchstone Method of Judging Poetry, 124

Brief Mention:—

EDWARD D. SNYDER, The Celtic Revival in English Literature, 1760-1800;—FREDERICK A. G. COWPER, Italian Folk Tales and Folk Songs;—T. M. CAMPBELL, Hebbel, Ibsen and the Analytic Exposition;—EGON COHN, Gesellschaftsideale und Gesellschaftsroman des 17. Jahrhunderts, 125

THE JOHNS HOPKINS PRESS
BALTIMORE

Eight Numbers a Year—Single Copy (Current) Sixty-five Cents

Entered as Second-Class Matter at the Baltimore, Maryland, Postoffice

Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103, Act of October 3, 1917. Authorized on July 3, 1918

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

Modern Language Notes

A MONTHLY PUBLICATION with intermission from July to October (inclusive)

This publication is devoted to linguistic and literary research and to æsthetic and philosophic criticism in the domain of English, German, and the related Germanic Languages; and of French, Italian, Spanish, and the other Languages of the Romance Group. Its purpose is also to promote sound methods in the teaching of the Modern Languages and Literatures.

The Subscription Price of the current annual volume is $5.00 for the United States and Mexico; Canada $5.25 and $5.50 for other countries included in the Postal Union.

Contributors and Publishers will please address matter for the English Department of the *Notes* to James W. Bright; for the German Department to William Kurrelmeyer; for the French Department to H. Carrington Lancaster; for the Italian and Spanish Departments to Gustav Gruenbaum. Other matter may be sent to the Editor-in-Chief. The address of all the editors is Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md.

Subscriptions and other business communications should be sent to the Johns Hopkins Press, Baltimore, Md.

PREPARATION OF COPY

All copy should be in typewritten form.

Underscore (for italics) all titles of books, periodicals, poems, plays and other separately published compositions.

Use numerals in designating foot-notes, and number foot-notes in unbroken sequence.

Use roman numerals for volume-reference, set off by a comma before a following page-reference.

SOME AUTHORS

By Walter Raleigh

A collection of Literary Essays 1896-1916, which justify the belief that Walter Raleigh will take his place as one of the great writers of his age. *Net* $5.00

WORDSWORTH: Lectures and Essays

By H. W. Garrod

A most profound and brilliant study of the poet that will be a real and lasting contribution to Wordsworth literature. The style of the book throughout is delightful. *Net* $2.50

THE CONTINUITY OF LETTERS

By John Bailey

A selected group of essays and lectures, dealing with some aspects of the English literature of the last three centuries, which will appeal to all lovers of literature. *Net* $4.20

THE ART OF POETRY

By W. P. Ker

Seven delightful literary essays on The Art of Poetry, Shelley, Samson Agonistes, Romantic Fallacies, Pope, Molière and the Muse of Comedy, Matthew Arnold. $2.00

OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS

American Branch

35 West 32nd Street, New York

Digitized by Google

Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES

VOLUME XXXIX   FEBRUARY, 1924   NUMBER 2

AN UNPUBLISHED CORRESPONDENCE OF HONORÉ DE BALZAC

The following letters, written by Balzac from Germany, and addressed to the housekeeper of his Passy home, Madame Louise Breugniol, are interesting because of the light they throw upon a rather disputed point of biography which, for various reasons, has never been sufficiently cleared up: Balzac's visit to Germany in 1845, when he travelled for several months with Madame Hanska, the Polish lady who, a few years later, became Madame de Balzac, and the subsequent visit of Madame Hanska and her daughter to Paris.

Owing to overwhelming and constantly accumulating debts, Balzac had been forced towards the close of 1840, to renounce and sell Les Jardies, his home in Sèvres. He had then established himself in the village of Passy.[1] At no period of his life had pecuniary obligations been so pressing as during these last days at Les Jardies, and at no period had creditors been so insistent. Balzac was at that time living the life of his Mercadet. He shunned as much as possible the society of his friends, and better

[1] In a letter to Madame Hanska, dated November 16-26, 1840, Balzac writes: "A compter du moment où vous recevrez cette lettre, écrivez-moi à l'adresse suivante: Monsieur de Breugnol, rue Basse, no. 18, à Passy, près Paris. Je suis là, caché pour quelque temps."—*Lettres à l'Étrangère (1833-1844)*, Paris, Calmann-Lévy, 1899-1906, vol. I, p. 546.

In a letter to his sister, Madame Laure Surville, dated Les Jardies, November, 1840, Balzac says that his new house will be ready, including a room for his mother, by December 5.—*Correspondance (1819-1850)*, Paris, Michel-Lévy, 1876, p. 347.

Digitized by Google   Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

to maintain secrecy, had all of his mail addressed to his gardener, Louis Brouet.[2] This refuge was 19 rue Basse—today the Balzac museum at 47 rue Raynouard—a rustic pavilion, sheltered behind and below a house facing the rue Basse, on the heights of Passy, overlooking Paris and the Seine.[3] Balzac took as his housekeeper Madame Louise Breugniol, a woman of thirty-eight, who remained in his employ until the winter of 1847.[4] Madame Breugniol seems to have been of robust constitution and good common sense, a careful Morvandaise housewife, whom Balzac, as his letters show, trusted implicitly, and whose advice he frequently sought. According to Louis de Royaumont, curator of the Balzac museum, it

[2] Compare the following unpublished letter addressed to his friend, Louis Desnoyers, one of the directors of the newspaper, *Le Siècle:*

[Les Jardies, décembre 1839].

Mon cher Desnoyers, retournez-moi promptement les nouvelles épreuves de ces 5 placards, et avant que vos ouvriers aient fini vous aurez reçu quelque vingt feuillets de copie. Les libraires ne sont pas venus. Je vous envoie ceci par la poste pour gagner du temps. Mille compliments,

de Balzac.

Envoyez-moi votre adresse au *Siècle* pour que j'évite de vous adresser les paquets chez vous.

Et mettez bien *Louis Brouet.*

Si je vais lundi à Paris, je vous le ferai savoir. Je remporterais les épreuves du tout.

[3] See Louis de Royaumont, *Pro Domo* (*la Maison de Balzac*), Paris, Figuière, without date, pp. 34-39.

[4] Balzac's spelling of this name varies from time to time. He writes it Brugnolle, Brugnol, or Breugnol, and always with the particle *de.* Royaumont, *op. cit.*, writes Breugniol, the spelling found in her "acte de décès," Dec. 24, 1874. The following "acte de naissance," copied from the townhall of Aunay-en-Bazois, Nièvre, shows still a different spelling.

"No. 32.—Du 29 Messidor, an douze. Acte de naissance de Philiberte, Jeanne, Louise Breugniot, née le même jour à deux heures du matin, fille du Sieur Lazarre [*sic*], Étienne, Breugniot et de Marie, Anne, Desruault. Le sexe de l'enfant a été reconnu être féminin. Présents témoins: Jean, Louis, Casseneuve, propriétaire à Château Chinon. Second témoin, dame Philiberte Des Ruault, épouse de Lazarre, Claude Lemaître, propriétaire à Château Chinon, par la réquisition à nous faite, par ledit sieur Breugniot, père de l'enfant, avec les dits témoins du sieur Breugniot, Lazarre, constaté suivant la loi, par nous, adjoint du maire de la commune d'Aunay, faisant fonction d'officier public de l'état civil.

[Signatures]

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

was either Madame Marceline Desbordes-Valmore or Balzac's sister, Madame Surville, who had chosen for him this new housekeeper.[5]

With Madame Breugniol in the triple rôle of housekeeper, advisor, and faithful watch-dog, Balzac remained in his Passy retreat until 1845, feverishly at work on the final novels of his Human Comedy.

In 1845, Madame Hanska and her daughter Anna were in Dresden, and Balzac was anxious to join them somewhere in Germany or in Switzerland, suggesting that they meet him at Frankfort or at Aix-la-Chapelle, from either of which cities he could maintain an easy communication with Paris and his publishers.[6] In February, he suggests that Madame Hanska and her daughter meet him at Mayence, where he would have his passport arranged to include them as his sister and niece, and that they should make a spring visit, incognito, to Paris and to the Exposition des Beaux-Arts.[7] He arranges to find them an apartment at Chaillot, quite near his Passy quarters, and arranges also the financial details of the trip, saying in his characteristic way, *Je me charge des théâtres, et peut-être aussi de la nourriture!*[8] At Chaillot, he continues in this letter to Madame Hanska, which is dated February 15, 1845, they will find a comfortable apartment, furnished carefully, a cook, a maid, and a groom, and everything prepared for a two months' visit. Madame Hanska, who had been ill, persuaded Balzac to postpone his journey, so that it was not until the end of April that he actually went to Germany, leaving Madame Breugniol in full charge of his Passy home and precious posessions.[9] This trip was shrouded in mystery. Balzac's usual correspondence with friends ceased during these months.

The lovers went for the month of May to Cannstatt, in Wurtemburg. It was there, towards the middle of the month, that Balzac wrote the following letter to Madame Breugniol, requesting her, among other things, to rent under certain conditions which he mentions a house on the rue de la Tour, Passy.

[5] *Op. cit.*, p. 38.
[6] *Lettres à l'Étrangère*, "*Revue des deux mondes*," Dec. 5, 1919.
[7] *Ibid.*, Jan. 1, 1920.
[8] *Ibid.*
[9] *Ibid.*, Jan. 15, 1920.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

Canstatt, mai [1845].

Ma chère madame de Brugnol,

Il est maintenant très sûr qu'il faut louer la maison nº 18 de la rue de la Tour. Vous pouvez arranger cette affaire, mais sur parole seulement, car il ne faut pas signer de bail sans que tous les changemens que les propriétaires sont disposés à faire ne soient convenus et que je les aie indiqués ainsi que les conditions auxquelles je tiens soit pour la rupture du bail au milieu du 2e terme de 3, 6, 9, soit pour les dégâts des teintures et autres. Ainsi, vous pouvez leur dire que nous louerons, et nous louerons à telles conditions et pour 3, 6, 9, mais il faut attendre le retour de Mr pour les conditions accessoires et l'indication des changemens.

Dites à Mlle Borel[10] que Mme H[anska] m'a rendu les 400′ que je lui ai donnés ainsi que les intérêts qu'elle lui doit et qui font la somme suivante:

toilette (prix de la)	440′
pour intérêts	144
	584

Ainsi, vous devez lui remettre en plus des 400′, 184 fr. pour qu'elle soit payée.

C'est 584′ que vous prendrez sur la première *nouvelle* que j'enverrai afin que n[os] comptes ne soient pas dérangés.

N'oubliez pas, dès que les actions de la Banque seront à 3300, d'aller chez l'agent de change (il ne faut parler qu'au 1er commis pour faire vendre et faire acheter 450′ de rentes en 3 0/0 en employant toute la somme qui proviendra des actions vendues. S'il y a de l'argent de reste, vous le remettrez à Sœur Marie Dominique avec son inscription de 3 0/0.

Soyez toujours au courant chez Plon de l'affaire de Monceaux;[11]

[10] Mademoiselle Henriette Borel, a native of Neuchâtel, had been a secretary to Madame Hanska in Russia, and also an instructress and intimate companion of Mademoiselle Anna Hanska. Leaving Madame Hanska's service in 1843, she accompanied a French family to Paris, and entered, much against her family's wishes, the Convent of the Visitation, Rue d'Enfer, where she died in 1857. See A. Bachelin, *Balzac à Neuchâtel*, "Musée Neuchâtelois," 1883-1884, citations from which are made in Spoelberch de Lovenjoul's *Roman d'amour*, second edition, Paris, Calmann-Lévy, 1896.

[11] Balzac began in 1845 to seek a home for his future bride, and among his suggested possibilities mentions a piece of land not far from the Bois de Boulogne, at the end of the Rue Miromesnil—la Folie-Monceau. The land was priced at 60,000 francs, and the house he reckons at 40,000 francs. See *Lettres à l'Étrangère*, in the "*Revue des deux mondes*," Dec. 15, 1919.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

avec l'argent des Jardies et celui d'ici, je puis payer immédiatement 60,000 fr., et les 30,000 autres dans l'année; au surplus, sur un mot d'avis de vous, j'irais à Paris pour terminer cette acquisition. C'est toujours un arpent et demi, bonne mesure autour de la ruine et du lac.

Par ma prochaine lettre, je vous dirai où et comment envoyer les épreuves.

Profiter de mon absence pour soigner votre santé, vous amuser.

Si le dessin du meuble est fini au *Musée des familles,* allez voir M. Picquié pour qu'il vous en donne une dizaine d'épreuves à part, et vous m'en mettrez une dans l'envoi des épreuves.[12]

Dites à Dutacq de vous envoyer Bohain s'il a besoin de moi, mais toujours 7,000 fr. pour sept feuilles de la *Com*[*édie*] *hum*[*aine*].

Le bail de la rue de la Tour devra commencer en janvier 1846, et vous vous arrangerez avec Mme Grandmain pour payer 3 mois de plus, car il faudra bien 2 mois pour déménager et arranger la maison de la rue de Latour.

Mille amitiés,

de Bz.

Tâchez toujours de découvrir pour juin et juillet un appartement meublé qui ne coûte pas plus de 300 fr. par mois, aux environs de la Madeleine: une antichambre, un salon et deux chambres à coucher, cuisine et salle à manger—au besoin, une seule chambre à deux lits suffirait, il ne faut pas monter plus haut que le 2e étage.

Arrangements for the visit of Madame Hanska and her daughter were evidently in preparation, and Balzac wishes them to have a furnished apartment for June and July. But he has other commissions for Madame Breugniol, and other changes of plans. In his next letter, flattering in tone, and complicated in matters of small finance, he outlines more in detail the proposed visit of his future wife and her daughter to Paris.

Hombourg, 22 mai [1845].

Ma chère madame de Brugnolle,

Aussitôt cette lettre reçue, informez-vous [auprès] du marquis de Courtavel si le café de pois chiches, qui l'a guéri de sa maladie chronique du foie, se fait avec les gousses ou avec les pois, ou avec les gousses et les pois.

[12] *Secrétaire de Henri IV et commode de Marie de Médicis, meubles florentins du 16e siècle retrouvés par M. de Balzac,* "Musée des familles," August, 1846, vol. XIII, pp. 321-323, with an engraving representing the Henri IV *secrétaire.* F. Piquée, as he himself spells it, was the director of the *Musée des familles,* for which, in 1841, Balzac had promised his collaboration.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

Dès que vous le saurez, écrivez la recette et adressez-la à l'adresse suivante: "Madame la comtesse de Kisseleff, en son hôtel, Kisseleff Strasse, Hombourg, près Francfort-sur-le-Mein, Allemagne," sans affranchir.

Vous trouverez, ci-contre, le modèle de la lettre à écrire.

Je viens de recevoir votre lettre, qui est, comme votre âme, très douce et charmante. Vous êtes toujours la même.

Maintenant, le voyage de Paris est tout à fait convenu. J'allais vous envoyer mille francs par une lettre de change; mais le Rothschild, que Claret m'avait dit être si gracieux pour moi, est en voyage, et je ne sais à qui m'adresser, en sorte que je prends le parti d'apporter tout moi-même.

Allez voir Mlle Borel, et dites-lui que le compte que je vous ai envoyé est fautif. Mme Hanska a accepté le compte comme Mlle Borel l'a mis dans sa lettre. L'erreur provenait des ducats, et le voici rectifié:

480 francs pour la toilette,
144 francs d'intérêts.
———
624 francs.

Elle a reçu quatre cents francs de moi. Deux cent vingt-quatre à lui donner; comme je vous ai compté les quatre cents francs de Lirette [13] dans votre argent, et que vous lui donnerez les deux cent vingt-quatre, c'est à vous que reviennent ces six cent vingt-quatre francs que m'a remis Mme Hanska, et elle m'a remis trois cent soixante-seize francs pour payer d'avance l'appartement, si on l'exige.

C'est six cent vingt-quatre francs [et] les trois cent soixante-seize [qui font] les mille francs que je devais vous envoyer et qui se divisent ainsi: quatre cents pour vous; deux cent vingt-quatre pour Lirette, et trois cent soixante-seize pour les dépenses préliminaires de l'appartement de Mme Hanska.

Comme vous ne serez pas embarrassée de trouver trois cents francs pour quelques jours, je préfère ne pas me donner les soucis et les ennuis d'envoyer une lettre de change. Mais j'aurai les soucis du transport d'une somme considérable.

Maintenant, chère "prêteuse," je crois vous avoir dit qu'il faut louer l'appartement pour deux mois, "en votre nom," car ces dames n'auront pas de passeport, et il faut qu'elles soient censées venir chez elles, ou chez une connaissance. Mme Hanska ne veut pas de cuisinière. Elle a peur d'avoir des ordres à donner et à commander. Elle préfère aller dîner tous les jours chez un restaurateur. Mais, outre le danger de rencontrer des Russes et des Polonais, elle ne sait pas que ce serait une dépense de mille francs par mois, et je l'amènerai à avoir un "accord" avec une bonne

[13] Mademoiselle Borel.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

cuisinière à tant par jour. Quant au domestique, tâchez d'en avoir un honnête et sûr.

Je suis de votre avis: il faut que le secret soit absolu.

Mais Mme Hanska veut maintenant que j'aie une chambre pour pouvoir loger aussi; j'aime mieux cela aussi. N'arrêtez pas de femme de chambre. Elle aura la faculté d'en amener une ou de la prendre.

Je vous écrirai toujours un mot le jour de notre départ, et vous aurez huit jours d'avance pour tout arranger. Ainsi tâchez de trouver un appartement avec antichambre, salon, deux chambres à coucher, et une chambre à part, outre la salle à manger et la cuisine et la chambre de la femme de chambre. Le domestique ne sera ni logé, ni nourri.

L'appartement devra être arrêté du 8 juin au 8 août.

Nous causerons de la rue de la Tour. Vous ferez bien de les entretenir dans l'idée que nous la louerons.

J'ai toute sécurité pour l'avenir, dans tous les sens. Anna[14] m'aime beaucoup, et je suis certain d'une admirable et cordiale entente.

L'affaire de Monceaux est déterminée.

Vous avez raison pour la gravure. Mais il y a d'autres raisons pour ne pas la faire servir: *Primo,* c'est toujours la même *charge.* C'est celle d'Hetzel dans les *Animaux* [*peints par eux-mêmes*], et celle de la *Monographie* [*de la presse parisienne*], et celle de Philippon.[15] *Secundo,* ce n'est pas digne.

J'ai pourtant si grand désir de voir réussir Chl[endowski] que je ne m'oppose pas à ce qu'il fasse une charge sur moi. Mais, il faut qu'elle soit spirituelle, et, celle-là, c'est une répétition.[16]

H. de Balzac.

By the end of the month of May, Balzac, at Cannstatt, had still

[14] Mademoiselle Anna Hanska, daughter of Madame Hanska.

[15] *Scènes de la Vie privée et publique des animaux. Les Animaux peints par eux-mêmes et dessinés par un autre.* Paris, J. Hetzel et Paulin, 1842, 2 vol. gr. in-8.

Monographie de la presse parisienne, par M. H. de Balzac, illustrée de scènes, croquis, charges, caricatures, portraits et grandes vignettes hors texte, avec un table synoptique de l'ordre gendelettre: extrait de "la Grande Ville, nouveau tableau de Paris." Paris, au bureau central des publications nouvelles, 1842, gr. in-8.

In the third number of *La Caricature provisoire,* edited by Charles Philipon, November 18, 1838, there appeared a *portrait romantique* of Balzac, to which he refers here.

[16] This "charge" was to appear in Balzac's *Petites Misères de la vie conjugale,* illustrated by Bertall, and published by Chlendowski, in 1845.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

different instructions to give his *chère prêteuse,* who so generously and on so many occasions had lent her name to the harassed debtor.

Canstatt, [fin mai 1845].

Ma chère madame de Brugnolle,

Mme Hanska a reçu les plus mauvaises nouvelles pour sa prolongation de passeport, et je me hâte de vous dire de ne pas faire de courses ni vous donner de mal pour les appartements et les dispositions dont je vous ai parlé. Attendez quelque autre lettre pour vous remettre en quête. Si le voyage n'a pas lieu, j'irai à Strasbourg pour vous renvoyer les trois mille francs par la diligence, car il faudra payer Lirette. J'irai dans une ville où mes épreuves pourront m'être envoyées gratuitement par M. E. Conte.

Faites faire le plâtre de mon buste, et envoyez-le le plus promptement possible. Je me mets aux deux romans de Chlendowski, car je ne reste ici au moins quinze jours.

S'il en est temps encore, mettez un tome quatre de la *Comédie Humaine* dans le paquet de Léon.

Vous pouvez m'écrire ici jusqu'au 10 juin. Amusez-vous et soignez votre santé.

Quand vous aurez reçu les trois mille francs, vous chercherez le plus beau velours violet de Lyon possible; vous en prendrez pour une robe, et les lés de rechange, corsage, etc., et vous l'enverrez à Strasbourg, à Silbermann l'imprimeur, chez qui j'irai le prendre.

Je vous donne cette commission d'avance, afin de n'avoir qu'à vous la rappeler, toujours dans le cas où Mme Hanska ne verrait pas cette année la belle France, car tout espoir n'est pas perdu.

Mais la prudence exige, en ce moment, de renoncer à Paris. Mais j'irai, pour terminer avec les vingt mille francs [à payer] par Fessart, et l'affaire de Monceaux, que je voudrais à mon nom. Recommandez de l'activité à M. Fessart, car je voudrais bien être débarrassé des sommes indiquées, et on le souhaite vivement ici, toujours pour arranger à mon nom l'affaire de Monceaux.

Si Claret est à Paris, obtenez de lui le croquis de la maison de Francfort, et les plans des deux étages. Vous me les enverriez par la poste.

Vous aurez d'ici pour les négociations Fessart: 3000 francs.

Vous avez en effet à escompter, y compris les deux mille francs Hetzel, que vous appliqueriez: 5000 francs.

J'enverrai en copie: 5000 francs.

Total: 13,000 francs.

Mais il ne faudra rien faire sans avoir le tout, et que M. Fessart profite surtout de mon absence, qui va se prolonger.

Ces treize mille francs se grossiront de deux mille quatre cents que Mme Hanska me remettra pour Lirette, et que je remettrai à Lirette lorsque je placerai définitivement sa petite fortune. C'est convenu avec Mme Hanska, et ce sera moi qui lui servirai les intérêts, pour le temps que je les aurai gardés.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

Comme voilà le voyage de Paris ajourné, demandez des loges tant que vous voudrez à ces messieurs. Dites à la famille que je reviens, et surtout avertissez-moi du moment où il faudra être à Paris, pour l'affaire de Monceaux.

[H. de Balzac].

Mon adresse jusqu'à nouvel ordre, est toujours à Cannstatt, près Stuttgart, Wurtemberg.

Plans for the June visit were far from complete, and apparently Madame Breugniol was finding difficulty in attending to all of her master's complicated business matters: the rental of the rue de la Tour house; the overtures for buying the Parc Monceau property; his dealings with his *homme d'affaires,* Fessart, and with his publishers, Chlendowski and Souverain. Balzac's irritation is apparent in the next letter, the tone of which is softened, however, by anxious enquiries after his housekeeper's health, and by a tiny note scribbled by Madame Hanska on the outer fold of the letter which reads as follows: *Avec mille remercimens et mille tendres amitiés de la part d'E. H.*

Canstatt, 8 juin [1845].

Ma chère Madame de Brugnole,

Vous avez bien mal lu mes lettres. J'ai eu chaque fois le soin de vous dire que relativement au voyage de Paris, tout était conditionnel et soumis à une lettre où je vous dirais si le voyage avait lieu.

J'ai reçu v[os] deux lettres, et celle adressée chez Mare . . ard, et celle adressée [ici]. Vous avez une lettre au moment où je reçois votre dernière par laquelle je vous félicite de bail de la rue de la Tour. Il est inutile de faire le bail avant mon arrivée; j'irai à Paris pour faire le bail, indiquer les changements à faire dans les distributions. Vous avez grand tort de m'en vouloir d'un défaut de mémoire pour les effets Chlendowski. Je vous renvoie le petit mot que vous m'envoyez; il aura servi à me faire faire mieux mes comptes pour pouvoir solder les créances dont la note a été remise à M. Fessart. Nous ne nous servirons de ces effets qu'au dernier moment et quand ils seront en échéance facile pour l'escompte. Il est même possible que je les réserve pour les paymens des dépenses auxquelles donnera lieu l'arrangement de la rue de la Tour, et que j'applique l'argent comptant aux affaires Fessart. Je ne perdrais alors rien, car M^me^ H[anska] fait par moitié avec moi l'arrangement de la rue de la Tour, comme l'acquisition de Monceaux.

Si vous avez quelques dédommagemens à donner à propos de vos appartemens, domestique, etc., pour le voyage manqué, payez et vous reprendrez cela sur l'argent que vous recevrez de Strasbourg par la diligence.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

Ce que vous me dites de votre santé m'afflige beaucoup . .
. . . .
Donc, essayez de ne pas vous teindre les cheveux pendant 3 mois, et vous verrez cesser tous vos maux. Quant à l'estomac, le docteur vous guérira si vous obéissez à ses ordonnances, car v[otre] maladie est bien reconnue. Ne vous faites aucun souci, pas même pour l'effet Chl[endowski] et les livres de Souverain, car vous seriez quitte pour rendre les 200 fr. à l'échéance à Chlendowski.

Surtout, attendez-moi pour le bail, et si les propriétaires ne voulaient pas attendre, écrivez-le-moi. J'écrirais les conditions par lettre en attendant le bail définitif.

Mme H[anska] n'a pas encore son passeport. Ne vendez pas les actions de Mlle Borel, car il faut toucher la dividende de juillet, et ne vendre qu'après. D'ailleurs, il y a le temps, puisqu'il vaudra mieux joindre la somme que Mme H[anska] lui rembourse pour grossir son placement. C'est ce que je vous explique dans la lettre que vous devez recevoir au moment où je reçois la vôtre. Elle va toucher près de 200′ d'intérêts à la Banque, et vous aurez à lui remettre le prix de sa toilette et les intérêts de Mme H[anska]. Elle aura de l'argent suffisamment.

Vous avez bien fait d'écrire à M. de Rambuteau.[17] Prenez beaucoup d'amusement et ne vous mêlez pas de la querelle de ma famille et de M. Nacq[uart],[18] car je tiens à conserver le docteur. Enfin, soignez votre santé.

J'attends l'annonce de l'envoi de mes épreuves pour aller à Strasbourg porter l'argent que je vous annonce.

Mettez l'adresse à la lettre pour Souverain et donnez-la à Chl[endowski].

Mille amitiés,
Bz.

On June 22, Balzac was in Strasbourg, where he visited his bankers, and made the final arrangements for Madame Hanska's visit to Paris, engaging three seats in the Paris *malle-poste* for Monday, July 7.

Strasbourg, dimanche [22 juin 1845].

Ma chère Madame de Brugnolle, je mets demain lundi 23, six mille francs en or aux Messageries Royales de la rue Notre-Dame-des-Victoires, à l'adresse de M. Vosseur, pour vous les remettre à vous-même.

Je serai le 9 à Paris. Gardez le secret sur ce voyage, car je ne viens pas seul. Je nous logerai dans un hôtel de la rue Notre-

[17] Prefect of the Department of the Seine from 1833 to 1848.

[18] Doctor J. B. Nacquart, Balzac's life-long friend and physician, to whom he dedicated *Le Lys dans la vallée*.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

Dame-des-Victoires, Hôtel de Tours ou Hôtel des Ambassadeurs. Ces dames ne resteront que vingt à vingt-cinq jours.

J'apporterai moi-même les épreuves que je suis venu chercher. Dites à Chlendowski de démentir en mon nom jusqu'à mon retour, et dites-lui que je serai le 15 juillet à Passy pour mon bail. J'y reviendrai ostensiblement dans les quinze premiers jours d'août. Vous savez qu'il faut que M. Fessart mette la plus grande activité [à s'occuper de ma liquidation].

Vous avez bien fait de vendre et d'acheter du bois pour mademoiselle Borel, car elle aura [ainsi] ses intérêts [courant depuis le] 3.

Je ne vous en dis pas davantage; je vous verrai le 10 du mois prochain. A bientôt, ma pet[ite].

[H. de Balzac].

On July first, Balzac and Madame Hanska, together with her daughter, left Cannstatt for Carlsruhe. It was here that he wrote his final instructions to Madame Breugniol, which are as follows:

Carlsrouhe, 2 juillet [1845].

Ma chère madame de Brugnol,

Ne tenez compte de la lettre que je vous ai écrite. Hier, en quittant Canstatt, j'ai fait d'accord avec ces deux dames un autre plan qui réalise les plus grandes économies, mais qui vous donnera quelque peine.

Puisque j'ai la maison de la rue de la Tour, dès mon arrivée, ces dames y logeront. Si les propriétaires sont aimables, ils se prêteront à cela. S'ils ne veulent pas, vous y ferez transporter le lit de la chambre de ma mère, et un lit en fer pour ces dames; puis un autre lit en fer pour moi, une commode, etc. Ce sera tout autant de fait pour notre déménagement. Enfin, vous les installerez là, vous trouverez bien une fille probe et intelligente pour leur servir de femme de chambre, à tant par jour. Marie gardera la maison. Ces dames viendront déjeuner et dîner rue Basse, et vous indemniseront de toutes vos dépenses. Vous prendrez, s'il le faut, une cuisinière et une fille pour servir chez moi. Vous direz, s'il le faut, que ces dames sont du Morvan, et [de] vos connaissances. Si nous ne pouvions pas aller immédiatement de la poste à Passy à notre arrivée, à cause du peu de temps que vous auriez eu pour tout préparer, rue de la Tour, (ce que je regretterais bien), nous resterions un ou deux jours à un hôtel; mais avec chagrin. Je compte donc sur votre activité si rare et sur votre exquise bonne volonté pour que, à notre arrivée, vous nous emmeniez rue de la Tour.

J'ai évalué à 300 fr., à peu près, vos dépenses pour un mois pour les déjeuners et les dîners, car ces dames aimeront, autant que je les aime, les fruits, melons, etc. Elles s'absenteront deux

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

ou 3 fois. Elles supprimeront ainsi les dépenses de l'hôtel et des restaurants, qui seraient presque 1200 fr. pour tout leur séjour.

Surtout, pas une indiscrétion avec ma famille.

Informez-vous toujours si Chopin est à Paris.

Prenez un abonnement au nom de M^lle Folini, rue de la Tour, 18, à l'*Entr'acte,* pour un mois à partir du 9 juillet jusqu'au 9 août, en vous assurant que le journal sera tous les jours avant midi rue de la Tour.

Il faudra aussi *louer* pour un mois un excellent piano.

Faites poser *le tapis bleu* dans la chambre de ces dames, et transporter les meubles de ma chambre à coucher. Vous prendrez alors ma chambre et mon lit, si v[otre] petit lit de fer était nécessaire rue de la Tour.

Prenez tous les aides nécessaires pour faire tout cela, et n'épargnez rien.

Pardon de ce surcroît d'ennuis, mais ces dames seront ainsi beaucoup plus en sûreté.

Mille amitiés,
de Bz.[19]

About the tenth of July, Balzac arrived in Passy with his two guests whom he took directly to the apartment they were to occupy at 18 rue de la Tour. Spoelberch de Lovenjoul has gathered from Madame Barbier, daughter of the owners of 19 rue Basse, several personal recollections of this visit, which he records in his *Genèse d'un roman de Balzac: les Paysans.*[20]

Balzac's guests remained for more than a month, returning to Dresden towards the latter part of August. He accompanied them as far as Brussels, and on the last day of the month was again in Passy.[21] As it has been already stated, there was a great deal of mystery attached to this visit of Madame Hanska to Paris, and to Balzac's ten weeks' visit to Germany. The novelist's correspondence, usually so active, practically ceased during these months of travel.[22] He had at that moment reached the highwater mark

[19] An English translation of this letter appeared in the *Literary Review* of the New York "Evening Post" for March 12 and 19, 1921, made by Mr. William H. Royce, a Balzac enthusiast and bibliographer.

[20] Paris, Ollendorff, 1901, pp. 190-191.

[21] See *La Revue des deux mondes*, Jan. 15, 1920.

[22] In all the published correspondence there are only two letters dated between April and August, 1845: one, addressed to an intimate friend, Froment Meurice, published in the volume of collected *Correspondance*, dated May; the other, dated Dresden, May 9, and addressed to the Director of the Dresden Royal Library, published in the *Modern Language Notes*, April, 1916, by the contributor of this correspondence.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

of his remarkable career, and three of his life's dreams were about to be realized: the termination of his monumental Human Comedy, crowned by his marriage to the woman he loved, and the purchase of a home in which he might enjoy a long wished-for rest. But before these goals were reached, innumerable tasks still confronted him. Publishers were demanding final pages of copy, the home had not been definitely chosen, and Balzac felt that he must see Madame Hanska, talk over many things with her, and that she must see his beloved Paris. The letters cited above were written during one of the busiest and most crowded years of their author's life. They were written to one of those rare and devoted servitors upon whom Balzac the man of letters, the harassed debtor, the lover, was so dependent, and will shed light upon one of the most fanciful episodes in his life: Madame Hanska's first visit to Paris.

WALTER SCOTT HASTINGS.

Princeton University.

BEOWULF 1422.

During the last few years, the dependence of Old English verse upon classic, especially Latin, antecedents has become increasingly evident. Klaeber, for example, has shown the obligations of *Beowulf* to the *Aeneid*,[1] and Rankin has convincingly demonstrated that a large proportion of the Old English kennings are translations or paraphrases of expressions in Scripture and in mediæval Latin poetry.[2] Much undoubtedly remains to be done before the complete indebtedness of Old English poetry to the Latin verse current in the period of its production has been revealed, and in the disclosure many scholars may be expected to participate. Here I would call attention to but one phenomenon, the peculiar collocation of rhyming words within the hemistich which is illustrated by the *flōd blōde wēol* of *Beow.* 1422, which appears to have suggested the *flōd blōd gewōd* of *Exod.* 463.[3]

[1] *Archiv*, vol. CXII, pp. 40-48, 339-359. See also my edition of the *Christ*, p. vii; *Mod. Lang. Notes*, vol. XXXIV, pp. 418-9; etc., etc.

[2] *JEGP.*, vol. VIII (1909), pp. 357-422; vol. IX (1910), pp. 49-84.

[3] Other imitations are *An.* 1528: *sund grund onfēng* (like *Beow.* 2810: *hond rond gefēng*); *An.* 1586: *hlyst ȳst forgeaf.* *Beowulf* has rhyming compounds: *wordhord* (259); *ðrȳðswȳð* (131, 736), *foldbold* (773); cf. Kluge, in *Beitr.*, vol. IX, pp. 422, 430.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

The poems of Aldhelm, of which the *De Virginitate* is the chief, have several examples of rhymes at the end of successive or alternate lines:[4]

Successive: 840-1 (*medelam: querelam*); 2837-8 (*tenebras: salebras*); 2856-7 (*latebris: tenebris*); *C. E.* 4. 7. 1-2, p. 25 (*cretus: fretus*).[5] The rhymes are sometimes merely grammatical: 386-7 (*rogorum: virorum*); 531-2 (*docentem: serentem*); 2016-7 (*tororum: honorum*); 2204-5 (*procorum: virorum*); 2834-6 (*loquentum: legentum: canentum*). Occasionally they are identical: 1159-60 (*labra labellis: labra labellis*); cf. 2137. See also 38-9, 310-1.

Alternate: 1657-9 (*fatescunt: mitescunt*); *C. E.* 4. 11. 6-8, p. 30 (*fatescant: liquescant*).[6]

Rhyming words are also found within the same line, but not adjacent (cf. 1120, 1581, 1648, 2109, 2502, 2754):

2600 Magni *cruenta* canes linxere *fluenta* tyranni.

Adjacent:

604 Tunc regis precibus surrexit *bella puella.*

765 Alter sic herebum lustrat *sine fine* profundum.

690 Nam paganorum destruxit *fana profana.*

C. E. 4. 3. 11, p. 22 Illius eloquio quæ *fana profana* friabant.

C. E. 4. 9. 4, p. 28 Sed Bartholomeus destruxit *fana profana.*[7]

[4] References are to Ehwald's edition (*Mon. Germ. Hist., Auct. Antiquiss.*, xv), 1919. Where no title is given, the poetic *De Virginitate* is to be understood, unless where two numbers are separated by a period, which then signify page and line.

[5] In *C. E.* 3. 6-7, p. 14, the intention of rhyming may be doubtful: *rura* novella; monastica *jura.*

[6] Rhymes are also to be found in the prose, of which the following may serve as examples: 75. 5-6 (*marcescit: tabescit*); 75. 6-7 (*pulsat: pascat*); 77. 13 (*mutis: brutis*); 204. 2 (*fatescit: marcescit*); 237. 13-4 (*flavescit: rubescit: fulgescit: splendescit*); 237. 23-4 (*maturescere: marcescere*); 247. 10-3 (*rubescit: marcescit: fatescat: senescat: virescit: adolescit*); 264. 9-10 (*insolescat: adhærescat*); 265. 9 (*fatescunt: vilescunt*); 301. 12-3 (*horrescit: pavescit: mollescit*); 305. 17 (*labescit: liquescit*); 307. 13-4 (*ganniture: lituræ*); 307. 24 (*mitescere: miserescere*); 308. 22 (*copia: inopia*); 320. 2 (*ratum: gratum*); 320. 3 (*promerentur: mitterentur*).

[7] Compare, in the prose, 419. 4-5: *fanis* colebantur stoliditate in *profanis.*

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

1983 Durior ut ferre foret ad *tormenta cruenta.*
2310 Affer cuncta simul nobis *tormenta cruenta.*[8]

We have already seen that *cruenta* and *fluenta,* of which the former (*bloody*) modifies the latter (*floods*), are to be found, though not adjacent, in 2600, quoted above; but a better original for the Beowulfian line 1422 is 2420 of the *De Virginitate,* where these rhyming words are in immediate sequence, and are, indeed, in the same order as the corresponding words in both the *Beowulf* and the *Exodus:*

2420 Crudelis tortor fundendo *fluenta cruenta.*

But not only are the corresponding words in the same order; the references are in both cases to persons of eminent virtue, public spirit, and attractiveness, who meet their gory fates at the hands of emissaries of evil. In the *De Virginitate* it is Victoria, a noble virgin, who, having delivered the city of Tribula from the ravages of a pestilential dragon, is put to death by the heathen powers on her refusal to worship at the altar of Diana (2419-21):

Idcirco macheram stricto mucrone vibrabat[9]
Crudelis tortor fundendo *fluenta cruenta,*
Virgineos artus consecrans sanguine rubro.

In the *Beowulf* it is Æschere, Hrothgar's "chief councillor, the head of the administration,"[10] to Hrothgar the most beloved in point of fellowship (1296-7), one whose hand helped Beowulf's every will (1343-4), and at the sight of whose severed head all the Danish nobles were grievously distressed[11] (1417-21; cf. 2124-7), who

[8] Cf. 2194-5: (*tormenta* tyranni: ferre *cruenta*); 1735 Martires effecti carnis *tormenta luentes;* 611 *rubicunda crepundia.*

[9] If the cruel tormentor brandished his naked sword, it must have been, one would think, to strike off the head of the virgin martyr, and indeed this is borne out by the expression in the prose account (309. 21), *ictu gladii interimitur.* There is much decapitation in *Beowulf,* though it is not always the cause of death: thus of Grendel (1590; cf. 1614, 1639, 1780), Grendel's mother (1566-8, 2138), as well as Æschere (1421; cf. 1298, 1330, 1406).

[10] So Liebermann, *The National Assembly in the Anglo-Saxon Period,* chap. 12, note 4.

[11] The people of Tribula became much attached to Victoria; after the expulsion of the dragon, "Victoriæ exemplis et monitis hæerescunt" (309. 18).

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

is slain by the demon mother of that Grendel whom the poet conceives of as an impersonation of evil and darkness, even an incarnation of the Christian devil.[12]

If an influence of the versified *De Virginitate* upon the *Beowulf* be conceded,[13] we may proceed to inquire what light this circumstance throws upon the superior limit of the latter's date. In the first place, it is clear that Aldhelm's poem was not written later than 690. The evidence is as follows: In the epistle to Ehfrith there occur four lines (494. 2-5), introduced by the words, "ut veridicus ait"; now these lines occur as 2855, 2844, 2845, and

[12] Klaeber, *Beowulf*, p. 1, and note 6.

[13] Here, perhaps, is a point of confirmation. In *Beow.* 1056-8,

> *nefne him witig God wyrd forstōde*
> ond ðæs mannes mōd. Metod eallum wēold
> gumena cynnes, swā hē nū gīt dēþ.

("... had not the wise God and the courage of the man kept off that fate. The Creator guided all the race of men, as he still does now.") may be indebted to Aldhelm, *Riddle* 100. 18-9. Here Nature (Creatura) says:

> Omnia quæque polo sint subter, et axe regantur,
> *Dum Pater arcitenens concessit,* jure guberno,

which has been thus translated by Dr. James Hall Pitman:

> All things beneath the sky,
> All guided by the axis, I command,
> *So long as heaven-ruling God allows.*

To which we may add (*ibid.* 7-8):

> Nam Deus ut propria mundum dicione gubernat,
> Sic ego complector sub cæli cardine cuncta,

thus rendered:

> Yea, as God sways creation by his word,
> So all things under heaven do I control.

Cf. 73. 6; 261. 5 ff.; 269. 5-7; 414. 1460 ff.; *Riddle* 7; 45.6. See also Klaeber, p. xlix, and note on *Beow.* 1056-62. Add *King Lear* 1. 2. 128 ff.

Another indication of the influence of Aldhelm upon *Beowulf* might possibly be found in *getrume micle* (922) and *mægða hōse* (924). In 1903 I referred these (cf. *JEGP.* 5. 155) to the *magna stipante caterva* of *Aen.* 4. 136. They might, however, conceivably come from the *densa comitante caterva* of four different lines in Aldhelm (26. 20; 417. 1547; 434. 1957; 438. 2076), three of which are from the much-read poetic *De Virginitate* (cf. *densa stipante corona,* 445. 2250).

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

2843 of the *De Virginitate.* The same epistle speaks of Archbishop Theodore (d. 690) as still active, and indeed militant (492. 17; 493. 4). Hence the versified *De Virginitate* must have been written before 690.

On the other hand, it is not easy to fix a date *after* which it must have been written. The prose *De Virginitate* is dedicated to a group of nuns of Barking Abbey, of whom Cuthburg, the quondam queen of King Aldfrith of Northumbria (reigned 685-705), was one. Aldfrith and Cuthburg separated, in order that she might devote herself to a monastic life. If this was after he ascended the throne, it must of course have been in 685, or later; this has sometimes been assumed, but on no evidence whatever, or at least none that appears satisfactory, though the conjecture is not in itself improbable. The prose thus dedicated was antecedent to the poem, but the twofold work was conceived as a whole, and executed with no considerable intermission (cf. 321. 4-11; 327, par. 1; 353. 17-9; 354. 45; 443. 2200; 469. 2867 ff.).

In the absence of documentary proof, there are certain general considerations which favor, for the completion of the twofold work, a date not far from 684. In 672 Aldhelm was still a student at what we may call the University of Canterbury. By 675 he had become Abbot of Malmesbury. After his friend Aldfrith ascended the throne in 685, and of course before his death in 705, Aldhelm (639-709) was to dedicate to him the long treatise on metre which contains his hundred riddles (in 695, according to Bönhoff, *Aldhelm von Malmesbury,* p. 103; cf. Manitius, *Gesch. der Lat. Lit. des Mittelalters,* p. 136). An undertaking like the *De Virginitate* could hardly have been executed in less than four years, one would think. Now in 672, at the age of 33, he was sitting at the feet of his Canterbury masters, the greatest European teachers of his generation; and three years later he assumed the headship of Malmesbury, where his labors were assiduous and prolonged. Before the age of forty he would hardly have been qualified by his knowledge of history and legend, his familiarity with poets and prosody, his technical skill, and his official suavity, to begin a prose treatise so full of elaborate rhetoric, followed by 2932 lines of Latin verse exhibiting such general correctness and fluency.

If now we are ready to assume that Aldhelm's *fluenta cruenta* was known to the poet who gave us *flōd blōde wēol,* we have approximately a *terminus a quo* for the composition of *Beowulf,* the

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

result being not so very different from those which have been attained by the employment of other means. And, incidentally, the conclusion reached, that a trace of Aldhelm's influence may be detected in the *Beowulf,* is not far removed from that which seemed to me somewhat more than plausible in my paper, *The Possible Begetter of the Old English* Beowulf *and* Widsith (pp. 335-9).

ALBERT STANBURROUGH COOK.

Yale University.

DOCTOR JOHNSON AND 'MUR'

"Speaking of Arthur Murphy, whom he very much loved, 'I don't know,' (said Doctor Johnson) 'that Arthur can be classed with the very first dramatick [sic] writers; yet at present I doubt much whether we have anything superior to Arthur" (G. B. Hill, Ed., *Boswell's Life of Johnson.* In six volumes, New York, 1904. II, 146).

Arthur Murphy, actor, playwright, barrister, friend of Samuel Johnson, has received from the critics too little attention in proportion to his importance in affecting the career of the great lexicographer. Twice, at least, Murphy was the means of making his friend's life happier and more fruitful than it had been up to that time. The two were intimate for a period of thirty years.

Murphy's career was varied and long, yet not entirely successful. He was born in Ireland in 1727—Johnson's junior by eighteen years—and died in England in 1805. In 1735 he went to England and thence in 1736 to France where he lived until 1744. In that year he returned to London. Between 1747 and 1749 he was a clerk in Cork. After this period of foreign residence he spent most of his time in London. From 21 October, 1752 until 12 October, 1754, he wrote and published *The Gray's Inn Journal,* a periodical somewhat similar to *The Rambler.* For a time he was on the stage, then he became a playwright. From this occupation he turned to the law as a vocation. He was admitted to Lincoln's Inn and practiced as a lawyer. In 1788 he retired from the bar. Joseph Knight, his biographer in *DNB.,* says of his plays,

"The comedies of Murphy have not in all cases lost the spirit of the originals from which he took them. Several of them were

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

acted early in the present century. His tragedies are among the worst that have obtained any reputation. . . Totally devoid of invention, Murphy invariably took his plots from previous writers. He showed, however, facility and skill in adapting them to English tastes."

Johnson and Murphy met in the summer of 1754 as the result of an error that might well have resulted in serious misunderstanding. While Murphy was publishing *The Gray's Inn Journal,* he was being entertained for a time in the country. With him was Samuel Foote, the famous owner of the Little Theatre in the Haymarket. When Murphy said he would have to go up to London to get ready the next number of the magazine, Foote suggested that he translate an article from a French periodical that he had. Later, however, Murphy found that he had translated from the French, one of Johnson's *Rambler* essays that had been translated into that language. Much embarrassed by his error, he decided to call upon Johnson in order to make his excuses in person. Mrs. Piozzi, speaking of this visit says, "he went next day, and found our friend all covered with soot like a chimney-sweeper, in a little room, with an intolerable heat and strange smell, as if he had been acting Lungs in the Alchymist [sic], making *aether*" (Piozzi, H. L., *Anecdotes of the Late Samuel Johnson, LL. D. During the last twenty years of his life.* London, 1786, p. 236). When Murphy later told this story in Johnson's presence, Mrs. Piozzi continues, the doctor said, "Come, come, dear Mur, the story is black enough now; and it was a very happy day for me that brought you first to my house, and a very happy mistake about the Ramblers" (*ib.*).

The acquaintance begun under these circumstances gradually developed into a warm friendship. Murphy remarks that the "first striking sentence, that he heard from him, was in a few days after the publication of Lord Bolingbroke's posthumous works. Mr. Garrick asked him, 'If he had seen them?' 'Yes, I have seen them.' 'What do you think of them?' 'Think of them!' 'He made a long pause, and then replied: 'Think of them! A scoundrel and a coward! A scoundrel who spent his life in charging a gun against Christianity; and a coward, who was afraid of hearing the report of his own guns; but left half a crown to a hungry Scotchman to draw the trigger after his death'" (Murphy, A.,

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

An Essay on the Life and Genius of Samuel Johnson, LL. D. London, 1792, p. 80).

In 1760, Murphy wrote *A Poetical Epistle to Samuel Johnson, A. M.* in which he praised his friend in the extravagant manner of the time. The poem itself is of no great merit. The introduction and conclusion are addressed to Johnson: the remainder of the poem is taken up with an account of Murphy's inability to write great poetry and with a tirade against the dullness of other writers of the day. The tribute to Johnson is couched in such lines as these:

> Whate'er you write, in ev'ry golden line
> Sublimity and Elegance combine:
> Thy nervous phrase impresses ev'ry soul,
> While harmony gives warmth and rapture to the whole.

Two interests tended to draw Johnson and Murphy together: their similar views in politics and their common interest in Shakespeare. Foot, in his *Life of Murphy,* says, "Mr. Murphy in his politicks [sic] was exactly in unison with Doctor Johnson; and that exchange of civilities which had brought them together, without much difficulty, grew into friendship. Doctor Johnson had commended Mr. Murphy's essay in the Gray's Inn Journal, upon the afflicting cause of the madness of King Lear, and Mr. Murphy would not be backward in acknowledging such an honour done him by such a man. They were, for ever after, to the end of their lives, the familiar friends, and upon all occasions, the steady adherents to each other" (Foot: *Life of Arthur Murphy, Esq.,* London, 1811, p. 312). Foot says elsewhere of the two men, "The one had been Shakespeare's Commentator for the Other" (*ib.,* p. 252). It is interesting to note that Murphy disapproved heartily of Garrick's mutilation of Shakespeare's plays. He considered the changes unwarranted (S. A. Dunham and others: "Arthur Murphy" in their *Lives of the Literary and Scientific Men of Great Britain,* in three volumes—D. Lardner, *Cabinet Cyclopedia,* vol. III, p. 321).

More than once the affairs of Johnson, Garrick, and Murphy became interrelated. In 1766, Murphy and Garrick quarreled because of Garrick's wish to produce an altered copy of Wycherley's *Country Wife* which seemed to Murphy to interfere with a play he had re-worked for the actress Miss Elliott. Garrick, desirous

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

of settling the dispute, wrote to Murphy offering to refer the matter to "your friend Mr. Johnson" (Foot, *op. cit.*, p. 207). On 11 November 1766, Isaac Bickerstaff wrote to Garrick: "I should be extremely glad to be an humble instrument in bringing two such men again together; and . . . I should be very glad to have you, Mr. Murphy, and Mr. Johnson there together, some night next week, by which time I shall have his bust set up in my room, who, like Shakespear to you, is the god of my idolatry" (*ib.*, pp. 208-209).

Some seven years later, 13 January 1773, Murphy wrote to Garrick reviewing the whole controversy. He mentioned the meeting arranged by Bickerstaff, and said: "I closed with the offer of Mr. Garrick's friendship, and dined with him and Dr. Johnson at Bickerstaff's house. After dinner, the Plays were mentioned. 'Pr'y thee,' says Doctor Johnson, 'do not talk of Plays: if you do, you will quarrel again.' He was a true prophet. Though I wished it much, no bargain was made with me" (Foot, *op. cit.*, p. 249).

One of the indications of the good terms upon which Murphy stood with Johnson is the fact that he was entrusted with the delicate task of informing the doctor that he had been awarded a pension. He tells us that at Lord Loughborough's request, he went to notify Johnson of the grant. Speaking of himself in the third person he says, "He [i. e. Murphy] went without delay to the chambers in the Inner Temple-lane, which, in fact, were the abode of wretchedness. By slow and studied approaches the message was disclosed. Johnson made a long pause: he asked if it was seriously intended? He fell into a profound meditation, and his own definition of a pensioner occurred to him. He was told, 'That he, at least, did not come within the definition.' He desired to meet next day, and dine at the Mitre Tavern. At that meeting he gave up all his scruples" (Murphy, *Essay on Johnson*, p. 93).

Yet more significant than these somewhat incidental relations between Johnson and Murphy was the part played by the latter in introducing the great man to the Streatham circle. Murphy had been a friend of the Thrales for a long time before 1764 [Murphy gives the date as 1765—*Essay on Johnson*, p. 98] when the first meeting took place between them and Doctor Johnson (Piozzi, *Anecdotes*, p. 125). In May, 1760, Murphy was apparently responsible for introducing Garrick to Mr. Thrale, for he

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

writes to him on 13 May: "You stand engaged to Mr. Thrale for Wednesday se'ennight. You need not apprehend drinking; it is a very easy home, and the scheme of going to Ranelagh will be agreeable to him. I am to dine with him tomorrow, in order to adjourn in the evening to Ranelagh, so fond is he of that place" (*The Private Correspondence of David Garrick with the most Celebrated Persons of his Time.* In two volumes, London, 1831. Vol. I, p. 116).

The Streatham circle is given by A. Hayward as "Burke, Reynolds, Garrick, Goldsmith, Boswell, Murphy, Dr. Burney and his daughter, Mrs Montagu, Mrs Boscawen, Mrs Crewe, Lord Loughborough, Dunning (Afterwards Lord Ashburton), Lord Mulgrave, Lord Westcote, Sir Lucas and Mr. (afterwards Sir William) Pepys, Major Holroyd afterwards Lord Sheffield, the Bishop of London and Mrs Porteous, the Bishop of Peterborough and Mrs Hinchcliffe, Miss Gregory, Miss Streathfield, &c" (Hayward, A., in his *Introduction* to *The Autobiography, Letters, and Literary Remains of Mrs Piozzi* (*Thrale*). In two volumes, London, 1861. Second edition. Vol. 1, p. 26). It was to this group, or to a portion of it, and to the Thrales themselves that Murphy introduced Doctor Johnson, a service for which all lovers of Johnson must be grateful to him.

Mrs. Thrale has left a description of her first meeting with the great moralist, and the subsequent course of their friendship. It is clear that Murphy was responsible for the meeting and it is not without significance that he was called upon to adjust a misunderstanding that had arisen. Mrs. Thrale says, in part,

"The first time I ever saw this extraordinary man [Doctor Johnson] was in the year 1764, when Mr. Murphy, who had been long the friend and confidential intimate of Mr. Thrale, persuaded him to wish for Johnson's conversation, extolling it in terms which that of no other person could have deserved, till we were only in doubt how to obtain his company, and find an excuse for the invitation. The celebrity of Mr. Woodhouse a shoemaker, whose verses were at that time the subject of common discourse, soon afforded a pretence, and Mr. Murphy brought Johnson to meet him, giving me general cautions not to be surprised at his figure, dress, or behaviour. . . Mr. Johnson liked his new acquaintance so much however, that from that time he dined with us every Thursday through the winter, and in the autumn of the next year he followed us to Brighthelmstone, whence we were gone before his arrival; so

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

he was disappointed and enraged, and wrote us a letter expressive of anger, which we were very desirous to pacify, and to obtain his company again if possible. Mr. Murphy brought him back to us again very kindly, and from that time his visits grew more frequent. . ." (Piozzi, *Anecdotes*, pp. 125-6).

Murphy, himself, was not unaware of the importance of his services in bringing together Johnson and the Thrales. In fact, he said that he "looks back to the share he had in that business with self-congratulation, since he knows the tenderness which from that time soothed Johnson's cares at Streatham, and prolonged a valuable life" (Murphy, *Essay on Johnson*, p. 98).

Murphy speaks also of a service he attempted unsuccessfully to render his friend. He says that at a time when he "was intimate with Garrick and knew Johnson to be in distress, he asked the manager why he did not produce another tragedy for his Lichfield friend? Garrick's answer was remarkable: "When Johnson writes tragedy, declamation roars, and passion sleeps; when Shakespeare wrote, he dipped his pen in his own heart" (Murphy, *op. cit.*, p. 53).

After Mr. Thrale had died and Mrs. Thrale had become the wife of Piozzi, Murphy continued his friendship with her. Johnson protested against her marriage; Murphy became a friend of her new husband. Mrs. Thrale has left on record that Piozzi "hated all the wits but Murphy" (Piozzi, *Autobiography, Letters*, etc., I, p. 352). He is mentioned among those who frequently visited her or wrote to her after her return from Italy (*ib.* I, p. 306).

Yet in spite of Murphy's differing with Johnson in regard to the treatment of Mrs. Piozzi, there is no reason for postulating a coldness between the two men. Doubtless after the break at Streatham, they did not meet so frequently, but in Murphy's last tribute to Johnson there is no hint of serious differences between them.

This last tribute was the *Essay on the Life and Genius of Samuel Johnson, LL. D.*, which Murphy wrote at the request of the booksellers who had published the works of his friend. He wrote the book in six weeks, at the Talbot at Richmond (Foot, *op. cit.*, p. 315). For this he received three hundred guineas (*ib.*, p. 314). The work is essentially fair to Johnson, but lacks the wealth of intimate detail that delights the reader of Boswell. It is too gen-

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

eral, too condensed to be great biography. The author tells us that the *raison d'être* of his book is the desire of the publishers to have a more concise account of Johnson's life to prefix to his works. "To comply with that request is the design of this essay, which the writer undertakes with a trembling hand. He has no discoveries, no secret anecdotes, no occasional controversy, no sudden flashes of wit and humour, no private conversation, and no new facts to embellish his work. Everything has been gleaned" (*Essay on Johnson,* p. 4). Murphy unintentionally sums up the causes of the defects in his work when he says, "The author of these memoirs has been anxious to give the features of the man, and the true character of the author. He has not suffered the hand of partiality to colour his excellencies with too much warmth; nor has he endeavoured to throw his singularities too much into the shade" (*ib.,* p. 186). Yet Murphy may be forgiven for his faults as a biographer when he says of Johnson, "His defects were spots in the sun" (*ib.*).

Of the literary circle in which Doctor Johnson moved, none has passed into deeper obscurity than has this man whom the Sage of the Mitre affectionately called "Mur." He is unknown to all except the investigator of the literary history of the eighteenth century. He was no mere literary hack; no one, however, nowadays would claim for him anything but minor rank among the second-rate writers of the time. A study of his plays is important in developing the history of the stage in the middle of his century. The judgment of the editor of the *Garrick Correspondence* is suggestive: in summarizing Murphy's literary ability he calls his author "The celebrated Arthur Murphy, Esq., whose dramatic talent, if not of the first rate, was best suited to the existing state of society, and, in truth, of infinite value to the London stage" (*Garrick Correspondence,* vol. I, p. 65, Prefatory Note). For the modern student of the eighteenth century, however, he is interesting not merely as a minor man of letters but also as a friend and benefactor of the central figure of his day.

JOSEPH M. BEATTY, JR.

Goucher College.

Digitized by Google

Original from
UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

GENIUS AS AN ALLEGORICAL FIGURE

An earlier paper[1] treated the origin of Genius, a famous allegorical figure in the works of Alan of Lille, Jean de Meun, and Gower. My present aim is to give a further account of this extraordinary personage.

In classical Latin the word *genius* applied to a higher self, a protective spirit who enforces moral conduct. The underlying philosophic doctrine has been traced[2] to Plato's *Timaeus,* and appears vividly in the *Apology* where Socrates spoke of a strange god which admonished him against doing evil. Medieval writers knew the *Timaeus* through Chalcidius' Latin translation and commentary. Alan of Lille in treating Genius preserved the reverent conception of classical antiquity. His figure is the august other self and confessor of Nature, who is God's vicar. Jean de Meun regarded him with less awe. Gower[3] brought him back to sober consideration by associating him directly with human beings, and accordingly deprived him of the majestic aloofness of Alan's excommunicator; still, he did not leave him as Jean's half-grotesque, vigorous demigod.

Gower declared that when he in his lovelorn state petitioned Venus and Cupid for grace, he saw the goddess and her son. She, dissatisfied with the poet's response to questions, decided that he should confess to her priest Genius. Most of the poem deals with the subsequent examination of Gower and with Genius' tales to exemplify love. The priest finally advised the contentious poet to follow reason rather than love.[4] Nevertheless, he had to refer the case to Venus. She restored Gower to reason, and Genius granted him absolution.

[1] "The Allegorical Figure Genius," *Class. Phil.*, xv, 380 ff.

[2] See Horace, *Epp.* II, 2, 187, with note in the edit. of E. C. Wickham. Oxford, 1903, II, and also Horace, *Odes and Epodes*, ed. P. Shorey and S. J. Laing, Chicago, 1916, note on *Od.* III, 17, 14; *Timaeus*, 90 A ff., R. D. Archer-Hind, London, 1888.

[3] *Complete Works of John Gower*, S. C. Macaulay, Oxford, 1901, vols. 2 and 3.

[4] According to the tradition, Nature must be obeyed. To love when old, as Gower imagines he does, would be contrary to Nature and thus against reason. Genius and the nobler Venus of the two Venuses in the medieval pantheon would urge reason, since they are supporters of Nature. See the later French cases for the more ignoble Venus.

Digitized by Google	Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

Like Jean's Genius, Gower's priest acted inconsistently. He could at once profess to know little except Venus' service, and yet give (Liber VII) an encyclopedic account of all knowledge, and discuss the duties of contemporary royalty. He even went so far (Liber V) as to deny the divinity of Venus. Thus he was related to Jean's sceptical figure. But despite his solemn bearing, he was less impressive than his predecessor, because the latter, degenerate though he was in comparison with Alan's Genius, still betokened a noble ancestry. Gower's Genius was an everyday sort of person.

He was also different from a similar personage in Martin Franc's *Le Champion des Dames*,[5] which was written early in the fifteenth century.

During the pilgrimage recounted by this late retort to Jean de Meun, "Sens Abesti," a homely, bearded curé, appeared at the altar in the Temple of Venus, acting as if he were good Moses instead of an ignorant, bare-footed, ass-eared creature. He set up a cry, "Here are the pardons of the church. Serve the lady well, or I will excommunicate you. Time is fleeting, seize your opportunity."

Genius had lost intellectual and moral sense, and had become loathsome "Sens Abesti." The ecclesiastic had descended from reason to the lowest point in his tradition, and for extreme sensuality. He taught a doctrine opposed to that of Alan and his contemporaries, and to that general tradition against intemperance of the flesh which developed on the basis of Alan's precepts[6] in Brunetto Latini's *Il Tesoretto,* in the Old French poem of the fourteeenth century, *Les Échecs Amoureux,* in Lydgate's *Reason and Sensuality,* and in other works even down to Spenser's *Faerie Queene.*

Genius recovered his old name in a poem by Jean Lemaire de Belges, the first humanist in the French vernacular during the Renaissance.[7] He was not an impeccable character in *La Concorde*

[5] See P. A. Becker, *Jean Lemaire, der erste humanistische Dichter Frankreichs*, Strassburg, 1893, pp. 298-9 and pp. 374-5.

[6] Compare my papers: "The Goddess Nature in Early Periods," *Jr. Eng. Ger. Phil.*, XIX, 224 ff.; "Nature in Earlier Italian," *M. L. Notes*, XXXVI, 329 ff.; "Nature in Old French," *Mod. Phil.*, XX, 309 ff., and "Nature in Middle English," *Jr. Eng. Ger. Phil.*, XIX, 186 ff.

[7] Compare A. Tilley, *The Dawn of the French Renaissance*, Cambridge, 1918, pp. 333 ff., and Becker, work cited.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

des deux Langages (1511).[8] Degenerate as was Jean de Meun's presentation compared with Alan's, it was surprisingly more wholesome than Jean Lemaire's. Yet the latter's was not abhorrent, though it revealed simony. Here is the plot:

The poet, overhearing two people dispute the relative merits of French and Italian, is asked for his written opinion. He recalls an earlier experience of his: he had seen the arrival of Venus in her chariot,[9] while nature responded with odors.[10] As the poet looked at her temple on a rock stronghold he invoked Clio to aid him to describe it. Genius was at the service as arch-priest, first primate of all Gaul, prelate of Venus. When he had offered pure incense and roses, he mounted his throne. He addressed first Danger, his deacon, bidding him prove his worth and see that nobody without money should approach the altar. Next he directed Belacueil, the subdeacon, to be attractive enough to gain rings and other tokens of value. After Dame Venus had given a sign because of the approach of an offering to her, Genius delivered a sermon on *Aetatis breve ver.* Youth, he said, should seize the present time. Let creatures while they are young serve God and Nature. Nature and Venus decorate the universe. Wait not for painful Old Age. Moreover, Nature becomes wrathful at delay. Therefore as previously he now threatened the recalcitrant with anathema. He declared that he himself had been created to guide and lead human beings to generation. As a result of his minatory eloquence, the congregation submitted. All present gave an offering to Venus. The poet, too, who had witnessed the ceremonies thus far, tried to present his gift, a manuscript. The watchful Danger, however, found it insufficient, and drove him off.

For many days thereafter the author wandered over sea and earth till he came to a great solitude. There a rock rose, and by a rivulet near its base he found fruit to refresh him. This great rock, higher than any mountain known on earth, rose above the clouds. It was a thorny height; its paths were dangerous, beset with hideous monsters. Yet if a person should successfully scale it, he would find happiness at the marble Palace of Honor and its great garden or court,—a terrestrial paradise. It was a place of sojourn for every good and loyal heart. Love reigned there with

[8] *Oeuvres*, ed. J. Stecher, 4 vols., Louvain, 1882-1891, vol. IV, pp. 98 ff. Cf. also H. Chamard, *Les origines de la poésie française de la Renaissance*, Paris, 1920, p. 169.

[9] Compare Petrarch's *Trionfo d'Amore.*

[10] A phenomenon old in allegorical literature, notably used with Natura in *De Planctu Naturae* by Alan of Lille. Lemaire uses actual setting at times, as here.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

Grace, Concord, Pleasure, Joy; knights and ladies strolled about amid singing and dancing. The season was unending spring, the hour eternal day. The chapel of the palace was the temple of Minerva. The ruler was Emperor Honor.

The poet, after reading an inscription at the base of the rock, fell asleep. He had a vision, in which he was awakened by Labeur, the historian, a grave, old and venerable personage, with long, white beard. The poet asked the reverend senior to explain the *ordonnance* on the rock, and learned that Jean de Meun had served France as Dante had served Italy. Thereupon Jean Lemaire decided to serve Labeur at his hermitage, in the hope of mounting the rock later. He would have two guides, Repos and Guerdon (Reward), if he wrote in French, not Latin.

Genius in Lemaire continued to possess power, and could wield his old, ecclesiastical weapons, as in Alan and in Jean de Meun. He was still the voluble preacher of the latter's portrayal, he still inveighed against race-suicide; but he could be won over by gifts to his institution. No longer was love so ideal as it had been, even with Jean, despite his mocking satire of ideals in his day. It was subject to the influence of wealth, as Papillon, an opponent of Charles Fontaine, later declared it to be in his *La Victoire et Triumphe d'Argent contre Cupido.*

The worst fate that befell the character of Genius, while he bore his own name, was to be exposed in virtual bribery. Not improbably, Jean Lemaire's poem is in part a satire on the tendency to greed among the ranks of the clergy high and low; for the poet lived in the age of Luther and came but shortly before humanists who were strongly affected by the spirit of reform, namely, Marot and Charles Sainte-Marthe.[11] On the other hand, the poem has an autobiographical element. Lemaire found advancement in the church and elsewhere none too ready; he supported staunchly his native tongue, and he devoted unusual abilities in narrative to a work half-historical, *Les Illustrations de Gaule.*

Lemaire's Genius as an instrument for satire followed thus the tradition from Alan of Lille. But he is like Jean de Meun's preacher, not Alan's secretary. The secretarial function appeared in Labeur, the aged hermit and historian, under whom Lemaire, touched with the Renaissance love of fame, was to work before ascending to the Palace of Honor.

[11] Compare the Scotch satirist, Lyndsay.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

The conception of love in the poem is not altogether unhappy. The tradition, persisting from the pious Alan, required a poet to treat love with gusto. We need not look with Mr. Tilley to "the Renaissance in its most pagan mood" for an understanding of Lemaire's animation, however much it coincided with the temper of the age. Accordingly, the love at the Temple of Venus is depicted sympathetically. But the poet reveals a chaster love amid calmer surroundings, that is, in the gardens of Honor, where sojourn not only scholars but knights and ladies.

Such a distinction as Jean Lemaire's [12] is in the mind of his admirer, Ronsard, in a "Discours" in *Le Bocage Royal,* II (1560),[13] addressed to the bishop of Toulon, M. de la Rovère.

On a rocky height the poet sees a temple of bronze built by Vertu. At its foot lingers a lovely goddess, Volupté,[14] who hails passers-by and tries to dissuade them from mounting the heights to Vertu. Instead she would have them go to her own palace.

Ronsard's moral opposes yielding to temporary desires. The true aim of life is to seek honor and virtue, even though the crowd be forsaken and the path be arduous. A similar view occurs in a poem by Clément Marot, *Le Temple de Cupido* (1515).[15]

Genius does not occupy a principal part in it, but the general situation is like the first part of Lemaire's work. The influence of his older friend appears from the plot:

In springtime, the season for Cupid, the god bids his eyes be unbound so that he can see all the lovers, kings, queens, and so on. Upon seeing Marot, he wounds him with an arrow. The poet finds his love unhappy, and decides to seek Ferme-Amour, or Loyal Love, who is a goddess under Jupiter. Hence he goes to the Temple of Cupid, where he hopes to find her. Many pilgrims travel

[12] The journey of a poet who eventually passes beyond the commoner, less valuable delights of love and gains saner walks of life, appears also in Jean de Hauteville's *Architrenius* and in *Il Tesoretto*. See note 6. Similarly, one may compare *Les Échecs Amoureux,* of which a full summary occurs in the *Romanic Review,* XI, 283 ff., given by S. L. Galpin, and which I have discussed with Lydgate's *Reason and Sensuality* in "Nature in Middle English."

[13] *Oeuvres Complètes,* ed. P. Laumonier, Paris, 1914-19, 8 vols., III, 335 ff.

[14] Apparently she derives most directly from Lemaire's *Les Trois Contes de Cupido et d'Atropos,* part II.

[15] *Oeuvres Complètes,* ed. B. Saint-Marc, Paris, 1879, vol. I, 8 ff.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

on the road with him that morning. At the fair temple, which is surrounded by an earthly paradise, he accepts Bel-Accueil's services, who is acting as porter and guide. For a while he watches the service of sacrifice to Venus and the worship of Cupid. The description is elaborate. The institution is fully provided with the necessaries of devotion. A person can even leave the world and become a monk or priest. In such a case, he goes before Genius, the arch-priest, to take the oaths and otherwise fulfil the degrees of the order. But where is Ferme-Amour amid the confusing welter of impressions? At last he finds her in the choir (*choeur* and *coeur* are the same for testing the true heart), and also a Prince and his Lady.

Here emerges the occasion of the poem: the compliment to the conjugal affection of Louis XII and Anne of Brittany.[16] The description of the general service resembles that in Lemaire's poem. Love of such a sort does not altogether satisfy the poet. The love he seeks is removed from the popular throng. Thus Marot at once harks back to the tradition of Alan of Lille in *The Complaint of Nature,* and also looks ahead to the distinctions made by the Platonists like Charles Fontaine,[17] as in the latter's *Response* to Papillon's *La Victoire et Triumphe d'Argent contre Cupido* (1537), and in his *La Contr' amye de Court* (1541). Marot does not turn from Love for the sake of historical study as Lemaire had decided to do. For literary reasons the treatment of Genius is different in proportion and in emphasis. The conception follows that of the older poet, but modifies the tradition. Genius inducts candidates into the priesthood or monkdom of Love. Marot possibly enjoyed the irony implicit in his extension of Genius' duties; such service normally entails celibacy, and is inconsistent with generation, the chief principle for which Genius had stood. The leader or director not only should preach sermons against race suicide to the multitude, but should aid others to enter his bachelor profession. Evidently, we have come very far from the great dignitary of Alan's *Complaint of Nature.*

In summary, no writer offers the same portrait of the allegori-

[16] Similar to allegories by the Scotch poets, Richard Holland and William Dunbar, and perhaps by Chaucer; see "Nature in Middle English," cited before.

[17] Cf. H. L. Hawkins, *Maistre Charles Fontaine, Parisien*, Cambridge, Mass., 1916.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

cal figure Genius. After his establishment on a lofty plane by Alan of Lille, Genius steadily altered for the worse, either in power or in morality. Despite his decline in the *Roman de la Rose,* he still maintained respectable authority, a presence more than human, even though his supernatural nature allowed him hardly less cynicism than that expressed by the celebrated mocking chimère which adorns the parapet of the contemporary cathedral of Notre Dame in Paris. His semi-diabolic character in Jean de Meun's poem caused him to be rechristened "Sens Abesti" by Martin Le Franc. On the other hand, his familiar manners gave Gower an opportunity to render him little superior to human beings. With Jean Lemaire, whose patron, Molinet, had recently translated Jean de Meun, he recovered some of his authority, but fell into the sin of simony. Lemaire did not restore Genius as regards love to the honorable station he held with Alan of Lille; nevertheless, he reemphasized the existence of two kinds of love. Whereas in Alan Genius supported virtuous love, in Lemaire he abetted vicious passion. Lemaire's younger friend and contemporary, Marot, was an admirer and translator of Jean de Meun. Consequently, he vulgarized Genius and placed him amid common services of Love, instead of with royal affection like that of the sovereigns of France. Alan would have approved him as a companion to Ferme-Amour rather than to Venus. Accordingly, though the tradition of two kinds of love survived to the sixteenth century from the Latin Platonist of the twelfth century and was reinforced by the Renaissance, Genius had shifted sides in French literature. The reason for the change was the characterization given him by Jean de Meun.[18]

E. C. Knowlton.

Ohio Wesleyan University.

---

[18] Spenser's unusual treatment of Genius requires more extended consideration, which I hope to give later with Spenser's treatment of the allegorical figure, Nature.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

NOTES ON CYRANO DE BERGERAC: A MYTHICAL TRANSLATION OF THE *HISTOIRE COMIQUE . . . DE LA LUNE*

An example of how a bibliographical slip may lead, in successive stages, to a chain of errors is furnished by a mythical English translation of Cyrano de Bergerac's *Histoire Comique, Contenant les Estats et Empires de la Lune,* which is said to have appeared in 1638, some nineteen years before the first edition of the original French text.[1] This English translation never existed. The origin of the mistake can be traced to Arber's *Transcript of the Registers of the Company of Stationers of London* (1875-1894). Mr. Arber misinterpreted an entry under the date of March 30, 1638: "Master Sparkes. Entred for his Copie vnder the hands of Master Wykes and Master spley warden a booke called *The discovery of a world in the Moone &c.*"[2] Misled, no doubt, by the similarity of the titles, he identified this *Discovery of a world in the Moone* with Cyrano de Bergerac's *Histoire comique des Estats et Empires de la Lune.*

The English work, however, is not a translation of Cyrano, but simply John Wilkins' *Discovery of a world in the Moone,* which was published in 1638. Not only is its title identical with the entry in the *Stationers' Register,* but it was "printed by E. G. for *Michael Sparke* and Edward Forrest, 1638."[3] Now "Master Sparkes" is the publisher for whom the entry was made. Furthermore, Wilkins obtained a privilege for his book from "Tho.

[1] The first edition was printed posthumously and with many omissions by Cyrano's friend, Henry Le Bret, in 1657. Two contemporaneous manuscripts, one of Paris and the other of Munich are also extant. See F. Lachèvre, *Les Oeuvres Libertines de Cyrano de Bergerac,* Paris, 1921, I, xcvi and l, and II, 314. Leo Jordan in *Savinien de Cyrano Bergerac's L'autre Monde ou les états et empires de la lune* (Dresden, 1910) discusses the two manuscripts, pp. 16 ff. It might be remarked that although the work of M. Lachèvre is in other respects very scholarly, he fails to take cognizance of Jordan, and this in spite of the fact that there are two distinct places in his two volumes where one might expect mention of his German predecessor.

[2] *Stationers' Register,* IV, 388.

[3] This quotation and the following are taken from a copy of the original edition in the library of the University of Illinois.

Digitized by Google
Original from
UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

Weekes R. P. Episc. Lond. Cap. Domest." on March 29, 1638, the day before the entry was made in the *Register*. What could be more natural than that Mr. Sparkes, the publisher, entered the volume in the *Stationers' Register* the day after he had obtained the permission for printing it from ecclesiastical authorities? From this discussion it is clear that the entry in the *Registers of the Company of Stationers* of March 30, 1638 was for Wilkins' well known book and not for a lost translation of Cyrano's *Histoire comique*.

Dr. A. H. Upham, in his otherwise valuable *French Influence in English Literature from the Accession of Elizabeth to the Restoration* (1908) accepts Arber's interpretation of the entry. Moreover, since there exists a translation of Cyrano's *Histoire . . . de la Lune* of 1687 with the following title: *The Comical History of the States and Empires of the Worlds of the Moon and Sun . . . newly Englished by A. Lovell,* he concludes that this translation of Lovell's is identical with the translation mentioned in the *Register* under March 29, 1638. He says in his Appendix A (p. 501): "(1638). Cyrano de Bergerac, *The Comical History of the States and Empires of the Worlds of the Moon and Sun.* (A. Lovell.) 1687." [The parentheses include the date of entry and the author of the translation, respectively]. This entry is especially remarkable since Cyrano had not finished his *History of the Sun* at his death in 1655, and it was not published until 1662 by Sercy in *Nouvelles Oeuvres de Cyrano de Bergerac.*

Further statements, well fit to startle students of French literature, appear:

" In 1638, too, entry was made of a translation, though perhaps only a partial one, of Cyrano de Bergerac's *Histoire Comique des États et Empires de la Lune.* This book had apparently drawn on an English work in its composition, *The Man in the Moon,* by Francis Goodwin. Goodwin, under the pseudonym of Domingo Gonzales had written this story of a moon-journey toward the close of the sixteenth century, while he was a student at Christ Church. Though not published until 1638, this acquired some notoriety in manuscript, and so influenced De Bergerac, who acknowledged his obligation by meeting Domingo Gonzales on the moon and engaging in conversation with him."[4]

[4] *French Influence in English Literature,* p. 377.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

Although Jordan has shown that Cyrano's *Histoire comique* was probably begun before 1643,[5] a date which is close enough to that of the supposed translation, the existence of such a translation is precluded by the comparison of the entry in the *Stationers' Register* with Wilkins' work, as given above. Cyrano, moreover, was in no need of seeing Godwin's manuscript, as Dr. Upham states, since he could have known the English edition of 1638 or the French translation of Godwin's work by Jean Baudouin which appeared in 1648: *L'Homme dans la Lune ou le Voyage Chimérique fait au Monde de la Lune, nouvellement découvert par Dominique Gonzales, Advanturier Espagnol, autrement dit le Courrier Volant.*[6]

WALTER H. STORER.

University of Michigan.

NIETZSCHE ON THE ART OF WRITING

"In the 'Roman Style' I found my particular bent," says Nietzsche in 1888, paying his respects to the writers of antiquity in an account reminiscent of his early enthusiasms. He recalls it had been while reading Sallust at School that he recognized in the compression and severity of his Latin text, in its contempt for "beautiful words" and "beautiful feelings" a principle in writing which

[5] *Savinien de Cyrano Bergerac's L'autre Monde*, p. 40. Lachèvre, *op. cit.*, I, 1, states that it was not completed until about 1648.

[6] Jordan, *op. cit.*, p. 51. Miss Charlotte E. Morgan has repeated the mistake of Arber and Upham in the chronological list of English prose fiction contained in her *Rise of the Novel of Manners* (1911), p. 168, under date of 1638: "*The Comical History of the States and Empires of the Worlds of the Moon and the Sun.* Translated from the French of Cyrano de Bergerac [Paris, 1638] by A. Lovell. (Upham).

"Another edition (the earliest recorded in *B. M.* catalogue), appeared in 1687."

This latter statement is also incorrect, for the British Museum possesses a copy of an English translation of 1659 entitled: *SELENARCHIA. or, the Government of the World in the Moon: a Comical History.* Written by that Famous Wit and Cavaleer of France, Monsieur Cyrano Bergerac: And Done into English By Tho. St. Serf. Gent. [See A. Esdaile, *A List of English Tales and Prose Romances Printed Before 1740* (London, 1912), p. 200, or Lachèvre, *op. cit.*, I, p. xcviii and II, 310.]

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

remained throughout his literary work one of his major quests. And of all his writing, in fact, only "Zarathustra," with its consciousness of poetic grace and suggestiveness, betrays an interest in anything beyond these fundamentals. With Nietzsche the "Roman Style," in which one could be "profound with simplicity, striking without rhetoric and severely logical without pedantry," was at once his ambition and his achievement.

It is a commonplace of literary criticism that Nietzsche did more for German prose than any other modern writer except Goethe; but that Nietzsche's excellence in writing came as a result of a rigid course in self-instruction quite comparable to that of Flaubert is a less known chapter in criticism. Yet from even a casual acquaintance with Nietzsche's work it is apparent that he is more concerned with the problems of style than with education or with literature. But the fact that Nietzsche has in no one place written either logically or exhaustively on style has led to the belief that his interest in writing is not comparable to his interest in ethics. It should be remembered, however, that much of the most pertinent discussion of writing to be found in the works of Flaubert, of Lessing, or in the journals of the Goncourt brothers is parenthetical and misleadingly casual. One is left to body out the criticism from much isolated comment, and one must read a large number of aphorisms and piece together the interrupted comment which runs through a half dozen volumes of Nietzsche's work if one would follow his full discourse on the art of writing. His chief texts, however, are so often repeated that one soon learns what is essential in his theory, although one is occasionally bewildered by the endless turning of a single theme. In fact, a series of Nietzsche's aphorisms on style, with its wealth of comparisons, its conciseness, and its unity of emphasis, has very often the effect of a sonnet cycle. It is as odd as it is agreeable to the student of Winckelmann, or even of Lessing, to follow a commentary written by a German (which Nietzsche is despite much fulmination in the index) where only the results are set down; and it is chiefly in the aphorisms, those delightful examples of the Roman Style, that one catches the drift of Nietzsche's opinions on writing.

Nietzsche is severely orthodox in the conviction voiced in numerous aphorisms that substance is the basic determinant of style, that good ideas predicate good writing. For the idea to be 'good' in the

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

Nietzschean sense it is necessary that it come to a certain maturity in the mind before being brought to paper. Nietzsche conceives all writing as the last and least important step in a long journey; it is the process that is gone through from the first springing up of the idea until the moment when it has at last become worthy of performance that he believes should receive the bulk of the author's labour. So much store does he set by the slow ripening of ideas that he vows in one place never again to read a book "which is born and christened with ink in the same moment." This vow betrays an idealism calculated to do away with the book industry. But Nietzsche would go further: he would prevent what he calls the "unripe procreation of thoughts" and "that irresponsible scribbling that goes on in school and college." Nietzsche's conception of the high seriousness and dignity of book making, which requires every author to win a victory over himself and his matter before presenting his work to others, is as little compatible with actual facts, perhaps as little desirable, as a race of blond supermen in Washington. Whatever Nietzsche's idealism may lead him to, however, we cannot quarrel with the principle that better writing means there has been better thinking, that writing is fundamentally a matter for the intellect; and the author who devises something worth saying is almost sure to have the taste and intelligence to say it worthily.

Deficient in substance and in organising power, the modern writers, according to Nietzsche, are too prone to make up their want of matter by a lavish use of means and effects. Nietzsche has scorn for all innovators in style,—those, for instance, who are attracted by current fads for particular words and phrases as well as for neologisms and archaisms. Nietzsche's thoroughgoing stoicism demands that the writer at the very beginning of his work set himself the task of limiting rather than of enriching his vocabulary: in place of fundamental brain work he must not permit himself a false pride in the intellectual jugglery of the paradox, which says nothing and proves nothing; neither may he indulge in a dishonest display of more emotion than he feels, any more than he should allow himself to be betrayed into yielding to his passion before the open ink-bottle. In discusssing David Strauss, whom he regards one of the worst stylists, Nietzsche condemns a continual use of cheap effects which takes the place of ideas worth permanence,

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

such as the rash comparisons wherein Kant is called the cold water cure and religion is said to occupy about the same place in the soul that the Indian possesses at present in North America. Nietzsche did not object to such comparisons in the proper place; in fact, his witty and incisive mind is thoroughly at home in those amusing metaphors in which he calls Victor Hugo "a lighthouse on the sea of nonsense." Michelet "enthusiasm in its shirtsleeves," Liszt "the institute of racing—after women"; what Nietzsche did object to was the inappropriateness of such comparisons as serious argument. All writers who have recourse to such cheap means for winning interest and attention Nietzsche excoriates as "the painted skeletons who try to make up for their want of flesh by artistic colourings."

The reason why modern writing is on the whole so shoddy Nietzsche finds in the tendency never to deny or to limit. "Thou shalt renounce!" says Nietzsche's master in *Faust*; and Nietzsche is disciple enough to say that all excellence, in writing as in morals, comes through self-denial. The old *cliché*—murder your darlings—Nietzsche heartily subscribes. It is particularly in the writings of the ancients that Nietzsche sees the good effects of denial and limitation: "one is soon done with counting their archaisms and exotic forms, but one never ceases to admire their light and delicate use of the commonplace and apparently long outworn elements in word and phrase." These are the authors whom Nietzsche celebrates as being able "to dance in chains"; they cheerfully accept all the restraint tradition imposes upon their work, and they then impose additional restraint of their own devising; they wish to appear to have less than the people, but they make a point of having that little, better. It is their magic to make writing appear easy under the severest limitations. Nietzsche says that Horace delighted him above all other poets, for in the Horatian ode, that carefully wrought mosaic of words, he observed the ultimate achievement in style, a minimum of compass and a number of signs and a maximum of effect in energy. Compared with the Horatian ode Nietzsche finds all the rest of poetry vulgar,—a mere sentimental twaddle. Similarly, he cannot praise too much "the noble poverty of the Greek orators" and the masterly freedom within the limits of that modest wealth which characterises their work.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

Affirmation of all the forces that tend to bring about the disintegration of style Nietzsche saw in the modern newspaper, for the journalist must be given *carte blanche,* to ask him to 'dance in chains,' to impose restraint upon his work would prevent his writing at all. Your journalist, says Nietzsche, first of all with his insufficient cause for writing, with his continual straining for effects, and with his ignorant disregard for all the canons of art can simply degrade and discredit good writing; moreover, when the newspaper style has become the accepted norm of writing the reader will have no background for the delicacies of fine literature. The best writing is never accomplished when the writer is thinking what effect his work will produce upon someone else; in modern journalism, as in most modern writing, the writers do nothing but calculate reactions and effects. Likewise, any attempt to make all experiences fit an underlying theory wrenches style out of its natural course, a fact emphasised in books which exist for the sake of a thesis.

In all Nietzsche's remarks on style nothing that he says impresses us as forcibly as his manner, which is orthodox and academical almost beyond recognition. He believes in a rigid course of self-instruction, first in learning to think, then in learning to write. One should write for one's self, easily and without affectation, seeking ultimately to attain to the virtues of pithy conciseness, repose and maturity. It is only natural that a thinker of so strong mental bias should carry over traits which are characteristic of his ethics into his theory of style. Of these his stoicism and sermons on the wholesome effects of self-denial are the most familiar; and his admiration of the ancients with a corresponding scorn for the moderns, particularly for the writing and the thinking of the modern Germans, are set pieces in his coruscations. But perhaps nowhere else in his writings is Nietzsche so approachable, so nearly companionable, or so sound as in these discussions of the art of writing. And for the moment he is pleasantly unconscious there are axes that must be ground.

ALLAN L. CARTER.

State College, Pennsylvania.

Digitized by Google

Original from
UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

REVIEWS

Die Kulturwerte der Deutschen Literatur in Ihrer Geschichtlichen Entwicklung. VON KUNO FRANCKE. Zweiter Band: *Von der Reformation bis zur Aufklärung.* Berlin. Weidmannsche Buchhandlung, 1923. Pp. xiv, 638.

To estimate a period by the spiritual values it has contributed to human civilization, is equivalent to subjecting it to the highest critical standards. Weighed in such a balance, the period of German literature from the sixteenth to the middle of the eighteenth century is found wanting. What will save the age in which we live from similar stricture, when measured by the future critic of human civilization? But Professor Francke, living in the present, has by this very fact the deeper understanding and readier sympathy for an age, which awakening from the narrowness of medieval traditions to the light of Humanism and the Reformation, was unfortunate enough to lose its ideals through selfish bargaining and prolonged strife. The author of *Social Forces in German Literature,* and *Personality in German Literature before Luther* (Lowell Lectures, 1915-1916), was already a master of his materials when he approached the task before him. He then spent several years in seclusion. reading and rereading, and the result is a work of outstanding scholarly and literary quality.

Professor Francke has written the tragedy of national literary aspirations preceding the great classical epoch of German literature. Luther and Lessing are the monumental figures at the boundaries of the period. The subject is divided into three parts: I. The Reformation and Counterreformation; II. The Period of Absolutism; III. The Age of Enlightenment. The subdivisions also show a correct subordination of detail to the larger aspects of the theme. Most effective and plastic are the portraits of personalities. We have Erasmus and Luther set in contrast with one another. Both magnificent advocates of intellectual liberty,—the one through humanistic studies arriving at the ideal of tolerance, the other through intuitions of truth and justice becoming the religious reformer and declaring the independence of thought. Yet each was bound by the limitations of his activity, the one inducted by his liberalism into the dangerous doctrine of the folly of taking life seriously, the other by his intellectual particularism

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

growing intolerant and opposing the social reform of the peasant classes that might have ended serfdom two and one-half centuries earlier.

Refreshing is the picture of the man who stood above parties, Sebastian Franck, whose verses *Von vier zwiträchtigen Kirchen* characterize him well:

> Ich will und mag nit Bäpstisch sein—
> Ich will und mag nit Luthrisch sein—
> Ich will und mag nit Zwinglisch sein—
> Kein Wiedertäufer will ich sein—

These are opening lines of stanzas in which he tells of the shortcomings of each religious party. Papistry dwells but on outward show; the Lutheran "Glaub! Glaub! macht die Menschen taub!" The adherents of Zwingli have "kein göttlich Kraft noch geistlich Saft"; the Anabaptists through intense suffering ("Not und Tod"), have been brought nearer to God, but they cling to formulas, and it is just such narrow dogmas of which the true Christian should free himself. Sebastian Franck was naturally treated as an enemy by all parties, but the lonely thinker undoubtedly did important service through his works, that became popular in Germany and Holland.

An interesting citation in the period of Absolutism is that of the Barockdrama *Das Friedewünschende Teutschland,* by Johann Rist, played in Hamburg in 1647, reprinted in 1806 when Prussia fell before Napoleon. The allegory in the play is so well adapted to conditions in Germany today, that a new edition would seem desirable.

From the depths of the abysmal Thirty Years War rises the inspiring figure of Leibniz, an intellectual giant born in the period of Germany's greatest political and social degradation. Professor Francke sees the evidences of this master mind reaching forward one hundred years to the epoch of German classical literature:

"Seine Definition des Glückes als nicht im Besitze, sondern im unablässigen Streben bestehend, klingt in Lessings herrlicher Charakterisierung des Wahrheitssuchers nach; seine Lehre von der Kontinuität der Entwicklung in der *Erziehung des Menschengeschlechts.* Sein Ideal der Harmonie der Kräfte hat teils in Kantischer Umformung den tiefsten Einfluss auf Schillers ganze Dichtung ausgeübt. Und seine Auffassung des Bösen als eines

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

Dieners des Guten hat ihre höchste dichterische Verklärung in Goethes *Faust* gefunden."

In the account of Christian Thomasius, the first university professor who dared to use the German language in the lecture room (1687-1688), we miss a reference to Andrew D. White's eloquent essay on the subject. It is found in his volume *Seven Great Statesmen,* Thomasius being included among the seven greatest contributors to human progress because of his warfare against witchcraft persecutions, against the use of torture in court proceedings, and in favor of emancipation of university instruction from theological control.

The tragic greatness of Lessing we find pictured in an age that yielded him a wage scarcely sufficient to save him from starvation. The helplessness of genius is well illustrated by the close of *Emilia Galotti.* The father slays his daughter to save her from shame, but not as the Roman Virginius does he appeal to the avenging populace,—such does not exist—a divine power above can alone bring justice and retribution.

Professor Francke is impressed with the deep significance of suffering in the development of the literary and artistic powers of a nation. The divine inspiration of Bach and Händel came at a time when the German people were reduced to the lowest level, when the soul of the nation could not find words adequate to express its gnawing pain under heavy infliction. The classical literary period of Goethe and Schiller, the succession of great thinkers Kant, Fichte, Schelling, Hegel, Schopenhauer, contemporaneous with Mozart, Beethoven, Schubert, such combined brilliancy in one epoch as perhaps the world has never seen, followed upon two and one-half centuries of political and social depression. The critic of cultural values points to cause and effect and draws hope from the present almost unprecedented sufferings of the German people.

In conclusion it remains to call attention to the beautiful unity in Professor Francke's book and to the perfection of style in which it is written.

A. B. FAUST.

Cornell University.

Digitized by Google

Original from
UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

RECENT FRENCH TEXT BOOKS

It would be impossible in the space at my disposal to review all the French textbooks which have recently appeared. An attempt will be made to give an adequate idea of the nature and scope of some of the more important of them.

Among the grammars published within the last few months there is the Aldrich and Foster revised edition.[1] It is an excellent grammar, attractively printed, with well chosen vocabularies and exercises; the lessons are carefully graded, with frequent review lessons. The old grammar has been entirely revised. Phonetic symbols have not been used in the body of the book, although there are many words that should have the pronunciation indicated for the student, such as *comptoir, le pouls,* etc., if "the sound of words pronounced irregularly" is to be shown as the preface promises. *Pays* (pp. 11 and 66) is usually considered *pɛi,* not *pei.* One wonders why *je lis* and *j'écris* are listed (p. 49) as irregular presents, when (p. 142) the "derivation" of the present indicative plural from the present participle stem is accepted. The statement (p. 193) that if both pronoun objects are in the third person "they are arranged in alphabetical order" should be corrected, for no account is taken of "il se le donne" etc.; there is no mention made of reflexive pronouns in the table (p. 194), and it is only on page 273 that the matter is cleared up. 196 C is apt to be disconcerting to the student, for there is a confusion of *usage* as in *a* and *b* with *form,* in *c.* The use of *celui-ci* and *celui-là* is not sufficiently explained. The statement (p. 223) that *ce* replaces *il,* etc. "when *être* is followed by a noun, a pronoun, or a superlative adjective" needs correction. No mention is made (p. 238) of the fact that *que* is also used as predicate of the verb. The statement (p. 273) that when "the reflexive pronoun is the indirect object, the participle is invariable" is not true, for it does not cover such cases as "les visites qu'ils se sont rendues," etc. Too much stress is placed (Lesson 40) on the passive forms which are identical with the English. A wrong impression is apt to be given by the definition of the past indefinite (p. 116) as "a com-

[1] Aldrich-Foster Roulé, *Elementary French,* Revised Edition, Ginn & Company, 539 pp.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

pound of the present of *avoir* with past participles" especially when (p. 131) the past indefinite of *descendre,* used intransitively, is asked for, also p. 162, "when the teacher returned." It should be pointed out (p. 126) that "quitter" is transitive and cannot be used in the illustrative sentence, "Does he not leave?" There is too much stress placed on the familiar singular imperative in Lesson 20 in view of the relatively infrequent use of this form by Americans.

"*French Grammar Made Clear*"[2] is a book containing misstatements, inaccuracies, and misprints which lack of space forbids discussing at length. It has no index and no exercises. The treatment of the demonstrative pronouns is not clear. It is wrong to state (p. 160) that "we ought to remember that adverbs can never be placed between the auxiliary and the past participle, *bien, souvent,* and *rarement* being the only exceptions"; that (p. 167) "avant que" governs the indicative; that (p. 46) *mon, ton, son* are "exclusively masculine" forms; that (p. 19) "the circumflex accent is pronounced with the lips wide open"; that (p. 67) *que* is used as subject when meaning "what"; that (p. 67) "which," followed by a noun can only be translated by a circumlocution: i. e. "laquelle des deux juments"; that (p. 189) "plus d'un" takes a plural verb. One wonders if M. Dimnet's knowledge of English or the proofreader's is at fault in certain cases: (p. 134) "We use the more subjective form of speech; ex: As I am afraid if, he were dead"; again (p. 31) he asks, "Does the French language use the definite article wherever there is *the* in English?" and answers his question by "No, *le, la, les,* are used in many cases in which *the* is left out in English." This does not reply to his question. He makes the incorrect statement (p. 190) that the verb is in the *singular* after *le peu de,* although he illustrates this observation by the following correct example: "le peu de gens qu'il voit l'en*nuient*." It is comforting to read (p. 133) that Americans, using the subjunctive in English more frequently than the British, find little difficulty in mastering its use in French." There are many pernicious pedagogical practices such as (p. 211) the heading: "Frequent mistakes to be carefully avoided" in which the errors are given more prominence than the correct French; or

[2] Ernest Dimnet, *French Grammar Made Clear,* Funk and Wagnalls Co., 236 pp. + v.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

again (p. 24) "*eu* is often wrongly pronounced like *u* in 'but'," with no constructive information to guide the student. There are numerous misprints, the third singular of the past definite being regularly written with the circumflex, pp. 85, 152, 153, etc.

Another grammar,[3] if such it can be called, is a good example of riding a hobby to an extreme. It is a combination of a handbook on phonetics and the direct method, prepared for "Senior High School pupils." One wonders how such a confused book, in which no grammatical principles are tangibly or succinctly stated, could have emerged from ten years of classroom "experimentation." The first part consists entirely of phonetic transcription with sentences in the exercises which, inasmuch as they deal largely with phonetic material, might be open to the criticism of dullness. Cf. pp. 193, 194, etc. Jesperson contended that students could well be kept for two years at the practice of phonetic transcription, but it is highly impractical to expect beginners whose mentality is measured by the quality of the sentences employed in the direct method exercises, to grasp the mass of phonetic material hurled at their unanalytical heads. It is a confused mingling of the abstract and the concrete. The author says in his preface that "it is only through reading that the American can come to appreciate French culture and civilization." One questions when the student using this text book would be prepared to do any reading. He encounters nothing but the present tense in the first fifty lessons (there are 162 lesons in all, covering the tremendous amount of 540 pages). He meets the past indefinite in lesson 51. The future is mentioned on page 361 in lesson 113, and the other tenses follow in the course of the remaining pages. We find the imperfect, for instance, on page 462. There is no index, and it is like seeking for the proverbial needle to discover the statement of grammatical principles, classifications, or other matters. The student would be overwhelmed by a sense of hopeless confusion. The rules that are given are poorly stated, as, for example, p. 384, *aimer* and *penser* are not necessarily "verbes qui demandent l'infinitif direct" as is implied, nor is it true that "il faut changer *du, de la, de l', des* en *de* après *pas.* C'est-à-dire, il faut employer *de* après la forme négative."

[3] *Première Année de Français avec notation phonétique*, par Arthur Gibbon Bovée, Ginn & Company, 546 pp. + 35 pp. (vocab.).

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

This is true only when the partitive construction is the direct object of a negative verb and not always then. There is no explanation of the use of the demonstrative pronouns. Much of the material that is given prominence is relatively unimportant in a first year book and should have been omitted for more vital principles.

There has just been published a good edition of Zola's contribution to the *Soirées de Médan,*[4] for use at the beginning of the second year in college, with notes rather too full, several pages of exercises in which the constant employment of the past definite in the questions is to be censured, several pages of idiomatic expressions in which there is too much insistence on *venir de.* The short introduction is a satisfactory summary of Zola's work and of his importance. There are few misprints. P. 28, l. 5, should read "rencontra"; p. 52 of notes to p. 4, l. 31, should read "il aurait pu"; p. 53 of notes to p. 5, l. 31, should read "compare page 4, line 19." In the notes there are one or two statements requiring correction. Note to p. 4, l. 22, why not "pluperfect" instead of "past perfect"? To p. 11, l. 10, "davantage" is not necessarily used at the end of a sentence instead of "plus." To p. 17, l. 1, "ne-plus = now" is apt to mislead. To p. 21, l. 17, preferably *douter* rather than *douter de* with meaning "to doubt," for *douter* is frequently followed by a relative clause. To p. 40, l. 20, "qu'as-tu?" means "what is the matter with you?"

The publishing of modern French texts,such as *La Peur de Vivre,*[5] enabling the student to read contemporary writers which would otherwise remain unknown to the majority, is a commendable undertaking. The introduction and notes are adequate. The book is attractively printed, having less than a dozen misprints.

Une Tache d'Encre[6] is a saccharine love story, interesting perhaps to young school girls, in which the notes are given in French. How much assistance to the student are such notes as (p. 54, l. 31) "réussissent à l'anéantir" to explain "en ont raison"? And why are not such expressions as "passer mon examen" (p. 9, line 23)

[4] Zola's *L'Attaque du Moulin*, ed. by Geo. D. Morris, Allyn and Bacon, p. 142.

[5] Henry Bordeaux, *La Peur de Vivre*, ed. by H. W. Church, Holt and Company, 276 pp., with notes and vocabulary.

[6] *Une Tache d'Encre*, par René Bazin, édition scolaire abrégée par Noëlia Dubrule, Ginn and Company, 219 pp. (110 pp. of text).

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

explained? The notes are of little grammatical assistance. The questionnaire employs the past definite instead of the past indefinite in the conversational exercises.

The editor should have eliminated some of the text in the *Histoire d'un Conscrit de 1813*,[7] for, in its present form, the time required for reading the story is too excessive to repay the effort. Its 209 pages cannot be read easily in their entirety in the second half of the first year with the short time available for reading. As the language is simple and the story interesting, the book might be profitably employed for outside or rapid reading at the beginning of the second college year. For those who are not surfeited with war books it can be recommended.

The *Contes de la France Contemporaine*[8] are very well selected and interesting although one wonders at the inclusion of such stories as *La Dernière Classe* and *Mon Oncle Jules*, which have been so frequently used. It seems overdoing the tendency toward pigeonholing the various writers to place Bourget in the group of "Conteurs de la vie nationale," or to make Maupassant, who has been dead nearly a third of a century, the sole representative of the "Conteurs de la vie contemporaine," and the story selected deals with the War of 1870. In the stories of "la vie des provinces" there are many unusual words encountered which make the stories rather difficult. It should not be used before the end of the second year of the college course. The notes are adequate and suggestive.

A reader for young high school students beginning French,[9] contains good anecdotes and good idiomatic material. The use of the past definite in questions should be avoided.

French Short Stories of Today is an attractively printed collection[10] by Clemenceau, Anatole France, Camille Mayran, Henry Bordeaux, Colette Yver, Anatole le Braz, Coppée, Marcelle Tinayre, and others with short introductions that give a fairly definite idea of their importance. There are no notes; the vocabulary is ade-

[7] *Histoire d'un Conscrit de 1813*, par Erckmann-Chatrian, ed. with notes, exercises, and vocab. by Madison Stathers, Ginn and Company, 288 pp.

[8] *Contes de la France Contemporaine*, edited with notes and vocabulary, by W. M. Daniels, D. C. Heath & Co., 264 pp.

[9] *Lectures Élémentaires*, by M. A. Luria and V. Chankin, Holt and Company, 181 pp.

[10] Edited with introductions, by Margaret W. Watson, Charles Scribner's Sons, 182 pp.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

quate. It would be good for use in second year French. One is disposed to ask why in the introduction to the selections from Clemenceau we read: "Few people realize that the 'Tiger' of France *was* not only a great statesman but a brilliant and versatile writer as well" (p. 1).

RALPH C. WILLIAMS.

Johns Hopkins University.

OLAV SKULERUD: *Telemaalet i Umriss. Ei utsyn yver maalsoga og maalgeografien i Telemark, serleg med umsyn paa Tinn.* Kristiania, 1918. Pp. 108.

The author of the present work has for a number of years been engaged upon studies in the dialect of Tinn in northeastern Telemarken, Norway. These studies necessarily led him into the wider field of the dialect region of Telemarken as a whole, and its position with reference to contiguous dialects. It is the results of some of his studies into this broader field that Mr. Skulerud has brought together here under the title: "The Telemarken Dialect in Outline." It is intended as an introduction to the larger work which is announced in the Preface as practically ready in manuscript; however, as the sub-title above shows, it offers more than an outline of this dialect. It also gives a history of the dialect, necessarily very brief, and a sketch of the dialect geography of the region with special reference to Tinn.[1] Mr. Skulerud shows a wide acquaintance with South Norwegian dialects and he knows at first hand the particular region he is here dealing with, being a native of Tinn. We welcome such an authoritative contribution to the subject. It is hoped that the publication of the larger work on the very interesting dialect of Tinn may not be long delayed.

Telemarken forms about four-fifths of the western and the

[1] Earlier works on the Telemarken dialect are those of Hans Ross in *Norske Bygdemaal*, II, 1906 (63 pages) and III, 1907 (12 pages), and the brief account in A. B. Larsen's *Oversigt over de norske Bygdemaal*, 1898, pp. 49-56, here considered with Numedal. Extensive word-lists illustrative of pronunciation and inflexions in the Parish of Tinn prepared by Professor Johan Storm, Christiania, were published in 1920 by the Christiania Scientific Society (Class II, pp. 1-96).

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

northern part of the Province or County of Bratsberg, the city of Skien lying approximately in its southeasternmost corner. To the east of Telemarken lies Numedal, which is united with it administratively, being the remaining division of Bratsberg. And also dialectically Telemarken and Numedal are linked rather more closely than is either region with the outside; but it is only in the extreme eastern part of Telemarken, about in the eastern half of Tinn, that a more intimate relationship is evidenced (ethnic, or due to close intercourse in historical times). To the northeast there is also a certain affinity evidenced with another of the so-called "dales"-dialects, namely Hallingdal, as is shown, e. g., by Amund B. Larsen in his *Oversigt over de norske Bygdemaal,* 1898, p. 58. Here, then, even in its connections on the east, Telemarken affiliates in some of its dialectal features with an East Norwegian dialect of extreme inland and border character, which has many West Norwegian characteristics. On the Southeast, however, Telemarken is wholly East Norwegian of the pronounced Viken dialect type (the dialects of the environs of Christiania Bay and to Smaalenene, inclusive). This southeastern section, the Bailiwick of Bamle, in reality falls outside Telemarken dialect geography proper. On the north (and northwest), Telemarken borders on the plains of Hardanger. It is seen, therefore, in what has been said, that Telemarken is in a very special degree a border dialect; it is the region where the conservative West touches upon the linguistically much more advanced East (advanced, here especially, having extensive levelling inflexionally). And it is also a meeting ground between the midlands and the dialects of the southern coast, with tendencies in many respects so divergent. I may add that the cacuminal *l* (thick *l*), which is a chief differentiating feature between East Norwegian and West Norwegian, divides Telemarken just about into two halves, north and south; on the other hand other features link the region as a whole with the East rather than the West.

The author finds in Telemarken proper three rather well differentiated dialects, the Eastern, the Northwestern, and the South-Western. The southeast (Bamle), with its pronounced Viken characteristics, also divides into a Western Bamle and an Eastern Bamle dialect (pages 3-6). Mr. Skulerud first gives the results of his examination of the charters of the Middle Ages, mostly of the XIVth century, that were written in Telemarken (pages 9-35).

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

And these seem to point very definitely to southwest Norwegian connections in early times on the part of all but the extreme eastern section of Telemarken proper. In its origin the dialect of Telemarken was probably, then, actually West Norwegian; it was settled from the West (and Southwest) as far as somewhat to the east of the present line of the cacuminal *l*, in the North to lake Möstrand. Then in the Northeast, western Tinn was settled later from the region of Möstrand, while eastern Tinn was settled from Numedal. These conclusions, based on language, seem to be borne out absolutely by anthropological investigations and by the study of place-names. There was clearly a third main course of settlement. Selgjord, which is the central parish in the whole province, shows some affiliation with the Southeast. Selgjord was perhaps in part settled from the southeast; but the Langesund Fjord was in the Middle Ages and down to modern times always an important lane of intercourse between the Southeast and east central Telemarken. And so the features noted may be of later origin. Literary influence upon the dialects of Telemarken shows itself most in the Southeast and in the regions immediately to the north of Skien and Norsjø. And as these have come in by way of the Southeast, so perhaps the former may, in a somewhat earlier period, have come the same way. As regards the parishes of Mo and Vinje and the Fyrisdal and Nissedal valleys the affiliation with the dialects of Agder, especially East Agder, is unmistakable.

The author speaks of the ancients lanes of intercourse (p. 2) and points out that such also exist over the highlands to Røldal and Hardanger. It would be exceedingly interesting to know if this early intercourse has left any marks upon the dialect in Western Telemarken. One should expect this, if it exists, especially in the Parish of Vinje and in the Lake Totak country. but we have no detailed investigation of the Vinje dialect. As regards the ascendancy of Viken influence the language of the charters is significant. As Professor Hægstad has shown the Northwest Norwegian chancery norm was dominant from about the end of the XIIIth century in Norway pretty much everywhere.[2] It was an early effort toward a literary norm which was based on Northwest Norwegian dialect and which apparently originated in Bergen, but shows Trondhjem influence. It also represents a departure from

[2] In *Maalet i dei gamle norske Kongebrevi*, 1902.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

the literary language of the classical age, which was Southwest Norwegian and which is also represented by Classical Old Icelandic. Now there are a great many charters written in Telemarken, mostly Skien, to be sure, that is in the region which falls outside of Telemarken proper (see above). The oldest of these charters, date 1303, follows the Northwestern chancery norm perfectly; but this is the only charter that does that. Immediately after that Viken forms are in evidence, as the negative prefix *ú-* (not *ó-*); the forms *þen, þet, þer;* cases of vowel balance, as *sændæ,* with long stem, by the side of *fara,* with short. From the first decade of the XIVth century, then, the influence of the East Norwegian dialect of Viken and the Upland counties, with its centers of culture in Oslo and Hamar (where the church had its schools) begins to be felt; and apparently especially in its southernmost form,—Viken and the coast.

With regard to *u*-umlaut before retained *u,* as *londum* (*londom*), the condition in the charters is somewhat mixed. Northwestern and Eastern influence both have to be reckoned with, but it seems likely that this West Norwegian law applied also to Telemarken. Modern dialect forms cited by the author are here of special interest (pages 18-19). One finds not only such a form as *pǫddə,* 'toad,' in the northeastern part, but the term *pöddə,* for Drangedal in the South, in a region bordering on the Southeast. It would seem, then, as Skulerud also evidently holds, that this form of *u*-umlaut extended, ca. 1300, to all of Telemarken. But at present it is absent in a great many of the feminine nouns that belong here (that is, weak nouns, type = *hǫrpə,* 'harp,' West Telemarken and Northwest, but *hærpə,* Southeast). It seems to me that we have here two factors operating: one a native tendency in Eastern Telemarken to levelling under the unumlauted form (*harpa, harpe,* now in some places pronounced *hærpə*); the other was the influence from the outside, especially from the Viken dialect, upon which Eastern Telemarken was already in the beginning of the XIVth century beginning in a measure to pattern its written language, something that in the course of time also began to find expression in the spoken language. But it is also possible that Danish influence has to be reckoned with after the union with Denmark; that would in this case have been precisely in the same direction.

But it may be that the problem should be considered as definitely connected with that of the absence of *u*-umlaut before lost *u* (the

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

older umlaut of *hǫnd,* f. and *lǫnd,* n. plur.). This law operated in Viken as well as everywhere else in Norway; but it is not now a feature of Viken Norwegian. As far as Telemarken is concerned, it is present in Telemarken proper, but it is absent in Southeastern Telemarken of Bamle and Solom, and evidently also as far up as Holla (all within Lower Telemarken). How all this is to be judged is at the present time a little uncertain. It is striking that so much of southeastern Norway agrees with Danish-Swedish upon this point. It may be noted that Telemarken has fifteen runic inscriptions from the period ca. 1150-1350, and these exhibit everywhere also the younger *u*-umlaut (*osmundar*). But then these inscriptions are all from Upper Telemarken, where of course we should expect it.

The work is attractively printed and almost entirely free from misprints. There is a good bibliography and a chart of the region dealt with.

George T. Flom.

University of Illinois.

The African Novels of Louis Bertrand: A Phase of the Renascence of National Energy in France. (U. of Pa. diss.). By D. C. Cabeen. Philadelphia: Westbrook Publishing Co., 1922. 106 pp.

This interesting study of *The African Novels of Louis Bertrand: A Phase of the Renascence of National Energy in France,* is divided into eight chapters; the first three, *The French in North Africa, The Renascence of National Energy, 1885-1914,* and *Flaubert's Salammbô as a Source of Inspiration for the African Novels of Louis Bertrand,* really offer but an introduction to the major study of Dr. Cabeen, and apparently form no part of his original research, for he states in the last sentence of chapter three, "How M. Louis Bertrand continues the task where Flaubert left off, and how this task broadens and acquires a new significance under the influence of the renascence of French nationalistic feeling in the twentieth century, is the subject of the study made in the following pages." [1] Chapter four, *The Life and Ideas of Louis Bertrand,* and chapter

[1] Page 37.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

five, *The African Novels of Louis Bertrand,* constitute the body of the dissertation. The remaining chapters are, *The Influence of Flaubert upon the Style and the Literary Methods of Louis Bertrand, A Critical Estimate of the African Novels of Louis Bertrand,* and the *Conclusion.*

In taking up a phase of the revival of the national spirit in France with its reaction toward Monarchy and Catholicism that followed the pessimism of the eighties and the early nineties, Dr. Cabeen discusses one of the most interesting aspects of French literary thought since the days of Renan and Michelet. In fact the whole question is one of such importance that it is to be regretted that the author limited his observations to repeating what Agathon says about it in his *Les Jeunes Gens d'aujourd'hui,*[2] and that he did not develop the theme by independent research, mentioning as a disciple of Barrès, such exponents of the *élan d'énergie national* as Marie Leneru,[3] and more particularly Ernest Psichari, whose hero, Maxence,[4] is profoundly stirred by "l'odeur de l'Afrique," and is proud that "devant l'Arabe il est Franc." The last point appears significant since Bertrand's sole interest lay in depicting the Latin in Africa as essentially superior to the natives.

The life of Bertrand as given in chapter four is too brief and sketchy to be of any great aid in appreciating his writings; but the discussion of his ideas is very full, and reveals much painstaking analysis and careful classification. Since Bertrand condemns pacifism and humanitarianism, and develops a doctrine of out and out imperialism, Dr. Cabeen would do well to tell us what effect this imperialism had upon the thought of France in the days before the war. In discussing Bertrand's literary methods he says that "he limits himself to representing, and does not make his heroes the spokesmen of his own ideas."[5] What relation, then, do his characters bear to his philosophic ideas? Or is Bertrand of moment merely as a philosopher and not as a novelist? If as a novelist also, the subject would have made a more direct appeal if chapters four and five had been combined, for the characters and plots dis-

[2] See footnote to page 25.

[3] See her *Journal,* 1922.

[4] See *Le Voyage du centurion,* 1916, and *Les voix qui crient dans le désert,* 1920.

[5] Page 58.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

cussed in chapter five admirably point out the relationship between the author's main arguments and his characters.

The chapter treating Flaubert's influence on the style of Bertrand is not fully convincing. Dr. Cabeen quotes one long selection each from Flaubert and Bertrand as a basis for a comparative study of style. A single comparison, however, well chosen, is of little value in determining tendencies. He might well here have discussed the element of color, since he refers to this feature repeatedly, and since every critic of the style of Bertrand mentions it. Flaubert had a very definite theory as to the significance of color,[6] making use of flat tones for the most part. Balzac, too, was a colorist who decorated interiors according to very pronounced preferences.[7] Did Bertrand work constantly with the same colors, and do very definite emotional reactions constitute part of his art? In his discussion of the "laboriously elaborated expressions"[8] of Flaubert, I believe the author misses a point that is essential to an understanding of Flaubert's style. It was something more than the "unusual sense" that led to the creation of these phrases. They are rather the result of a very carefully studied vowel sequence and of an acute sense of a special harmony of rhythm. In this very characteristic it seems to me Bertrand has been vitally influenced by Flaubert.

From the critical estimate of Bertrand's novels we conclude that he successfully continued the "unfinished African epic where Flaubert left it,"[9] and gave to French literature a new type, the colonial, "a man of will and energy." How far, however, can we conclude in regard to his merits as a literary artist? The methods by which he secures his literary effects are only partially revealed even in the chapter on style. Thus this study seems, as I suggested earlier, less a discussion of Bertrand as a creator of literature than as a philosopher, or as an historian of the influence of North Africa in the rehabilitation of the waning vigor of France. Such, perhaps, was the author's purpose. Like all dissertations of any importance

[6] Cf. *Le Journal des Goncourt*, tome I (17 mars, 1861).

[7] For a partial discussion of Balzac's treatment of color, see Clouzot, H., *L'Ameublement dans la Comédie Humaine*, in *La Revue de la Semaine*, 2 décembre, 1921.

[8] Page 87.

[9] Page 100.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

this one leaves a problem yet to be solved. What is the significance of this renascence of energy in the development of French thought and ideals, and how is it operating today? I hope Dr. Cabeen will choose to carry on his investigations into the broader aspects of this interesting movement, and that he will soon give us a study of these broader aspects as they are found within France herself.

Syracuse University. RAY P. BOWEN.

CORRESPONDENCE

SHELLEY'S REVIEWS WRITTEN FOR THE *Examiner*

As a result of a recent discovery of two notices in Leigh Hunt's *Examiner* for 1817 I think it is now possible to postulate with some measure of certainty that Shelley's reviews of Mary's *Frankenstein* (3 vols., 1818) and Peacock's *Rhododaphne* (1818) were written for insertion in that newspaper.

In the *Examiner* for Sunday, December 28, 1817, had been published, over Shelley's pseudonymous signature of E(lfin) K(night), the poet's review of his father-in-law's novel of *Mandeville* (3 vols., 1817). We know that, perhaps encouraged by this publication, Shelley afterward continued sending in material to this newspaper, for in the *Examiner* for January 4, 1818, we read the editor's note that "The Sonnet from Zappi will be inserted with pleasure, and so will the fine one entitled *Ozymandias*"; and immediately after this another note: "*Marianne's Dream* also is not forgotten among our poetical stores." Shelley's *Ozymandias* appeared over the signature of "Glirastes" in the *Examiner* for January 11. But *Marianne's Dream,* from the same pen, was reserved by Leigh Hunt for publication in his *Literary Pocket-Book* for 1819. It there appeared over the signature of Δ (Delta).

Now for the reviews of *Frankenstein* and *Rhododaphne,* both well known to be Shelley's, and both, for some reason or other, not published in Shelley's own life-time, but issued posthumously. One (the *Frankenstein* review) was among Medwin's salvage from the poet's manuscripts, published under the title, *The Shelley Papers,* in 1833. The other, found in the late seventies among Leigh Hunt's personal papers was first presented to the world by that keen Shelleyan, H. Buxton Forman, in his privately-printed issue of *Notes on Sculptures in Rome and Florence Together with a Lucianic Fragment and a Criticism of Peacock's Poem "Rhododaphne," by Percy Bysshe Shelley,* 1879. For what purpose did Shelley write these reviews? Obviously, for publication in some journal of the day, which might thus promote the sale of his wife's novel and his friend's poem. But for what newspaper?

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

The fact that the *Rhododaphne* review was actually discovered among Leigh Hunt's papers would lead one to imagine that Shelley had sent that review, at least, to Hunt. In 1818 Hunt was still editing the *Examiner;* and the days of the *Indicator* and the *Liberal* had not yet come. Therefore, it would seem probable that Shelley wrote the review of *Rhododaphne,* at least, for insertion in the *Examiner.*

The evidences, now first presented, that Shelley destined both of these reviews for the *Examiner,* and that Leigh Hunt at first intended to print them in that paper, are these. In the *Examiner* for Sunday, March 1, 1818, Hunt promises: "The Review of *Rhododaphne* next week or the week after." In the *Examiner* for Sunday, June 7, 1818, he pledges: "A Literary Notice next week on the excellent Works of Charles Lamb, which have just appeared. The succeeding Notice will be on *Frankenstein;* the next on *Endymion,* by John Keats; and the one after on the various productions of the Author of *Melincourt.*" This second note has a double interest, for it reveals not only that a review of *Frankenstein* was assured, but suggests that a more comprehensive review of Peacock's writings, which would probably include consideration of *Rhododaphne,* had perhaps caused Hunt in June to pigeon-hole Shelley's review of that poem, which had been copied out by Mary Shelley in the preceding February. Whether Shelley actually attempted such a general review of Peacock's early works is not known.

Yet none of these reviews, promised in the second notice, appearing in the *Examiner* as pledged, we read on unsatisfied until, in the issue of that paper for Sunday, August 30, we encounter this belated explanation: "The Literary Notices were not resumed, because the book-season, as it is called, had passed, and it was found that they would have been of little comparative use. They will appear toward winter." Some favorable criticisms of Keats, excerpted from the Alfred Exeter paper, were published in the *Examiner,* for Sunday, October 11; and others, excerpted from the *Chester Guardian,* in the *Examiner* for November 1. On October 25 Hunt took occasion, in the *Examiner,* to differ with some of the views of the Alfred Exeter reviewer (who was Keats's friend, John Hamilton Reynolds) as to the effect which the peculiar and individual characters "of certain contemporary poets would have upon their success." The promised Lamb review appeared at length in two instalments, in the *Examiner* for Sunday, March 21, and Sunday, March 28, 1819.

But so far as I can ascertain, though they never appeared in that journal, Shelley's reviews of *Frankenstein* and *Rhododaphne* would seem, from all the evidences now in hand, to have been written and accepted for publication in the *Examiner.*

WALTER EDWIN PECK.

College of Wooster.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

Dante and Statius

In view of Dante's manifest knowledge of Statius, it may be interesting to compare the famous line

> Nel mezzo del cammin di nostra vita

with the *Thebais*, I, 390,

> medio de limite vitae
> In senium vergens.

This is at least a striking verbal parallel. And the figure involved is not a mere commonplace. The 'path,' the 'way,' the 'course,' of life are trite enough; but the particular fancy that the middle of man's life is the half-way point of the road he is travelling is not so easy to find. (Seneca has something of the sort, *Ad Polyb.* XI, 3, "alium in medio cursu vita deserit." And in 1484 Antonio Geraldini could write, *Ecl.* II, 32, "medio sed limite vitae Curris adhuc victor.")

The usual comment on the Italian line is to cite the fancy of Dante's *Convivio*, IV, 23, that the course of our life rises and sinks like an arch, or like the arc of a circle. The "half-way" point of it is at the top; the latter half of it is a "decline." (So Dr. Samuel Johnson could write, in a letter of Aug. 14, 1780, "according to Galen, life begins to decline from thirty-five.")

If this passage of the *Convivio* is in point, it only makes my parallel from Statius the more interesting. There is nothing in "nel mezzo del cammin di nostra vita" which necessarily implies the "rise and decline" of life. On the other hand, they are pretty plainly implied in "in senium *vergens.*"

It may be noted, too, that "in senium vergens" (or the similar phrase in Lucan, I, 129) suggests the very special word *senio* which Dante uses in the *Convivio* for extreme old age, IV, 24, etc.

Finally, the *Convivio*, IV, 25, quotes the very story of the *Thebais* in which "medio de limite vitae" occurs:

"E però dice Stazio, il dolce poeta, nel primo della *Tebana Storia*, che quando Adrasto rege degli Argivi vide Polinice vestito d' un cuoio di leone, e vide Tideo coverto d' un cuoio di porco salvatico, e ricordossi del risponso che Apollo data avea per le sue figlie," etc.

The Latin story begins:

> Rex ibi tranquille, *medio de limite vitae*
> *In senium vergens*, populos Adrastus habebat.

W. P. Mustard.

The Johns Hopkins University.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

A Sidelight on Shelley

An incident shedding remarkable light on one side of Shelley's character, and one which appears hitherto to have escaped the notice of the poet's biographers, is recorded in Leigh Hunt's *Indicator,* No. xlvi, of Wednesday, August 23, 1820, page 364. There, in the essay on "Coaches," Hunt remarks: "We must relate another anecdote of an Irish post-chaise, merely to shew the natural tendencies of the people to be lawless in self-defence. A friend of ours, who was travelling among them, used to have this proposition put him by the postillion, whenever he approached a turnpike. 'Plase your honour, will I drive at the pike?' The pike hung loosely across the road. Luckily, the rider happened to be of as lawless a turn for justice as the driver, so the answer was always a cordial one;—'Oh yes—drive at the pike.' The pike made way accordingly; and in a minute or two, the gate people were heard and seen, screaming in vain after the illegal charioteers,

> Fertur equis auriga, neque audit currus.
> Virg.
> The driver's borne beyond their swearing,
> And the post-chaise is hard of hearing.

As to following them, nobody in Ireland thinks of moving too much, legal or illegal."

The friend Leigh Hunt here refers to was Shelley, as is seen from Hunt's own footnote to the reprint of the *Indicator* of 1840 (Part II. page 13). In the original edition of his paper, however, the essayist refrains from identifying his friend, so that biographers of Shelley who searched the *Indicator* files only, and not the reprint, naturally missed the allusion.

Shelley visited Ireland only in the January-February of 1812 and in the March-April of 1813. The incident related must, therefore, have taken place on one of these occasions, while Shelley was engaged in manifesting so decidedly his sympathy for the cause of Catholic Emancipation.

A. Stanley Walker.

College of Wooster.

"Areytos" in Sidney's *Defence of Poesy*

The following passage in Sidney's *Defence of Poesy,*[1] has provoked some discussion:

"Even among the most barbarous and *simple*[2] Indians, *where no writing is,* yet have they their poets, who make and *sing songs*

[1] A. S. Cook edition, Boston, 1890. See p. 4.
[2] The italics are mine.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

(*which they call areytos*), both of their *ancestors'* deeds and praises of their gods,—a sufficient probability that, if ever *learning* come among them, it must be by having their hard dull wits softened and sharpened with the sweet delights of poetry."

Churton Collins, in his edition of *The Defence,*[3] stops short with the following conjecture:

"*Areytos* must be the plural of *areito,* which, in the *Gran Diccionario* of Aniceto de Pages, is said to be a word of Indian origin meaning, 'a popular song of the ancient Indians of the Antilles and of Central America.'"

Professor A. S. Cook[4] quotes a definition of the word which was given to him by Professor Brinton of Pennsylvania, and then continues:

"A fuller account, probably from Oviedo, but not a mere transcript, is given by Purchas, *Pilgrims,* Lib. v ch. 3."

The passage to which Professor Cook alludes, and which he quotes at length, was subjoined by Purchas to a selection from Richard Eden's *Hystorie of the weste Indies* (1555). This interesting book was a series of extracts from Fernandez de Oviedo's *Historia General de las Indias* translated and published by Eden under the title of *The Decades of the newe worlde or west India.* The significant fact, however, is that Eden stops just short of the passage under discussion,[5] and concludes with these words to account for his omissions:[6]

"As touchynge other thynges of this Ilande whereof Peter Martyr hath more largely intreated in his Decades, I have thought it superfluous to repeate the same ageyne owte of this hystorie of Gonzalus Ferdinandus: but have here gathered only suche thynges as eyther are not touched of Peter Martyr or not so largely declared."

Purchas was evidently not so eager to conserve space:[7]

"Thus farre I have given you from Master Eden his Edition, wherein because many things necessary to the naturall History of the Indies are in the Authors Summarie, and in his 20. Books of a larger Historie, I have added hither such things as I thought fittest."

And it is in the portion added that the passage quoted by Professor Cook appears.[8] Now, since Purchas *His Pilgrimes* first saw

[3] Oxford, 1907, p. 68.

[4] *Defence,* p. 67.

[5] Cf. Purchas' *Pilgrimes,* ed. of 1625, Vol. III, p. 994 and Eden's *Decades,* ed. of 1555, p. 213 back. Richard Willes, when he augmented and reissued Eden's book in 1577, also omitted the passage. Cf. *The History of Travayle in the West and East Indies,* by R. Eden and R. Willes, London, 1577, p. 225.

[6] *Decades,* p. 213.

[7] *His Pilgrimes,* III, 994.

[8] Cf. Purchas' *Pilgrimes,* III, 994.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

the light in 1625, it is obvious that Sidney did not get his information from that book. He must either have read Oviedo in the original Spanish,[9] since no translation into English of the "areytos" passage had appeared by Sidney's time, or he got it from another source. Eden's allusion to Peter Martyr as containing the same material which the former chose to omit from his translation of Oviedo probably gives the answer. For in the same book with *The Hystorie of the weste Indies* Eden translated three *Decades* of Martyr, in one of which occurs this description of Indian manners:[10]

Perhappes your holynesse wyll marveil by what meanes these *symple* men shoulde of soo longe contynuance beare in minde suche principles, *where as they have no knowledge of letters* . . . They gyve them selves chieflye to two thynges: As generally to lerne thoriginall and successe of thynges: And particularlye to reherse the noble factes of their graundefathers great graundefathers and *auncestours* as well in peace as in warre. These two thynges they have of owlde tyme composed in certeyne myters and ballettes in their language. These rhymes or ballettes, *they caule Areitos.* And as owre mynstrelles are accustomed too synge to the harpe or lute, so doo they in lyke maner *synge these songes.*"

Eden's marginal note, which directs attention to the passage, is "The maner of lernynge;" and Sidney's topic, for the moment, was "learning."

Even so good a linguist as Sir Philip would normally have recourse to his own language first.

R. R. Cawley.

Princeton University.

Dryden's Prologue to the *Prophetess*

The prologue which Dryden wrote for a revival of Fletcher's *Prophetess* in 1690, as Cibber relates, "was forbid by the Lord *Dorset,* after the first Day of its being spoken. This happen'd when King *William* was prosecuting the War, in *Ireland.* It must be confess'd, that this Prologue had some familiar, metaphorical Sneers, at the Revolution itself: and as the Poetry of it was good, the Offence of it was less pardonable."[1] Editors of Dryden have, in general, followed Cibber's story, and have further stated that this Prologue first appeared in print in the second edition, 1708, of

[9] Several editions of Ramusio's *Delle Navigationi et Viaggi,* containing a translation of the passage from Oviedo, had appeared before *The Defence.* E. g., cf. Venice ed. 1565, Vol. III, p. 112. In French, J. Poleur's translation had been published at Paris in 1555.

[10] Eden's *Decades,* p. 125.

[11] C. Cibber, *Apology,* 3rd edition. London, 1750, p. 283.

Digitized by Google	Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

The Annual Miscellany for the Year 1694.[2] But a version of the Prologue had appeared a year before this, in the *Muses Mercury* for January, 1707, pp. 3-5. This version differs from that printed in the *Annual Miscellany* in some minor details, and has an additional line following l. 24 of the accepted version,

But we shall flourish sure when you are paid.

An explanatory note appended to the *Prologue* in the *Muses Mercury* charges Shadwell with the responsibility for the suppression of this prologue. As this item seems to have escaped attention, it is here reprinted in part.

"This Prologue was forbidden to be spoken the second Night of the Representation of the *Prophetess.* Mr. *Shadwell* was the occasion of its being taken notice of by the Ministry in the last Reign: He happen'd to be at the House on the first Night, and taking the beginning of the Prologue to have a *double Meaning,* and that Meaning to reflect on the *Revolution,* he told a Gentleman, *He would immediately put a stop to it.* When that Gentleman ask'd, Why he wou'd do the Author such a Disservice? He said, *Because while Mr.* Dryden *was Poet Laureat, he wou'd never let any Play of his be Acted.* Mr. *Shadwell* informing the Secretary of State of it, and representing it in its worst Colours, the Prologue was never Spoken afterwards, and is not Printed in Mr. *Dryden's* Works, or his Miscellanies."

R. P. McCutcheon.

Wake Forest College.

The Touchstone Method of Judging Poetry

Matthew Arnold's famous exposition of the touchstone method of judging poetry in the equally famous essay prefixed to Ward's *English Poets* inevitably opens up the question as to previous use of the term in this connection. The *NED* does not list any occurrence of the word in the sense of a test of literature or the arts. J. W. Bray's *History of English Critical Terms* does not recognize it at all. Thomas Warton has, however, preserved for us the most suggestive name of "a small black-lettered tract entitled the Touch-Stone of Wittes, chiefly compiled, with some slender additions, from William Webbe's Discourse of English Poetrie, written by Edward Hake, and printed at London by Edward Botifaunt in 1588. . . ."[1] Hake's work is unfortunately lost,[2] but

[2] Dryden's *Works*, Scott ed., x, 406-8: *ibid.*, Scott-Saintsbury ed., x, 407. Dryden's *Poems*, Cambridge edition, p. 260.

[1] *The History of English Poetry*, 3 vols., 1840; Vol. III, p. 228.

[2] G. Gregory Smith, *Elizabethan Critical Essays*, 2 vols., 1904. I, 226-7, is my immediate authority for this. Saintsbury's *History of Criticism* does not mention Hake.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

from this description and from Webbe's treatise we can infer that it forms a collection of "touchstones." This is not only the earliest use of the term in a specific literary sense that I know of, but as the title of a whole treatise devoted to this method of criticism it possesses unique interest.

The closest parallel I know is King James VI's statement:

"To knaw and discerne thir kynde of wordis from vtheris, your eare man be the onely judge, as of all the vther parts of *Flowing,* the verie twichestane quhairof is Musique." [3]

It is difficult to believe that the touchstone method has not been specifically mentioned in seventeenth or eighteenth century writing, but I am unable to recall any instances. Perhaps some student of the history of criticism can supply references.

PAUL KAUFMAN.

American University.

BRIEF MENTION

The Celtic Revival in English Literature, 1760-1800, by Edward Douglas Snyder. (Cambridge, Harvard University Press, 1923. 208 pp.). The Celtic revival in English literature, 1760-1800, produced one poet of real merit, Thomas Gray, whose poem, "The Bard," exerted a great influence on the other Anglo-Celtic poets of this century, and a considerable number of poets and writers whose works had been pretty well covered with the dust of a century and more till Professor E. D. Snyder brought them into the light in his recent volume on this subject. Like so many other manifestations of the Romantic Movement most of these Celtic-English works flourished chiefly in the by-ways and hedges of literature, in current periodicals and obscure editions, and their presence there shows the extent to which the desire for new experience in the world of letters had extended into the ranks of the less cultured public. Professor Snyder traces the progress of the revival through the agency of Lewis Morris and Evan Evans into the works of Gray, Mason, and Macpherson, and thence into the ephemeral products of the very minor writers of the last four decades. Rather briefly Professor Snyder deals with the question of the sources and influences of the works of Gray and Mason, and he gives a succinct discussion of the Ossianic controversy and of the influence of Macpherson upon subsequent literature. Certain aspects of the revival are presented as subjects for further research, such as the "complex interrelation of politics and literature," the connection between religion and the study of primitive poetry, the Celtic influences

[3] *Ane schort Treatise, conteining some revles and cautelis to be obseruit and eschewit in Scottis Poesie,* 1584. In Gregory Smith, *op. cit.* I, 216.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

in American poetry, and the "harmony of spirit among all the eighteenth-century poets and antiquaries who were seeking for information about the mythology of northern peoples." Professor Snyder's book is a useful guide to the beginnings of Celtic-English literature and an excellent point of departure for one who would carry on his study into the later revival of the last twenty years.

J. W. T.

Italian Folk Tales and Folk Songs. Edited by Frederick A. G. Cowper. (Chicago, The University of Chicago Press, 1923. 165 pp.) Nothing shows more clearly the great advance made in recent years in the teaching of the modern languages than the publication of texts like the one before us. Not so very long ago the only accessible Italian reading for the beginner consisted of a play or two of Goldoni and extracts from the *Promessi Sposi.* Even at the present moment large fields of Italian literature are unrepresented, and Professor Cowper's selection of Italian folk tales and folk songs is a welcome and novel addition to the teacher's rather scanty resources.

Modern-language texts are usually selected, for obvious reasons, from works representing the literary classics. The dialects of the people, however interesting they may be, are not suitable for students in the early stages of their work, and, indeed, at any time are more properly of philological, rather than of literary interest and value. It was a happy idea, then, for Professor Cowper to select from the popular literature of Italy a certain number of tales and songs which introduce the student to a new and fascinating field of study.

The editor, of course, did not propose to offer to the student a work on the dialects of Italy. Consequently, his texts are taken from collections in the Tuscan or literary dialect, "modified in such a way as to make the language conform in general to the standard Italian speech." There are fifteen popular tales, fifty-seven *rispetti* and *stornelli,* and one hundred and twenty proverbs. There is also a brief but sufficient introduction, the notes and vocabulary are excellent, and the form of the book attractive.

Although it was not in the plan of the work to offer the student an introduction to folk lore, either general or Italian, it is greatly to be hoped that some who use this volume will be led to see that popular tales are interesting to others than children or scholars. The reviewer may perhaps be pardoned a personal reference. He can never forget the day, eventful for him, when, just fifty years ago, while glancing over the new *Revista di Filologia romanza,* his eye fell on an article in the second number, *Nuovo Saggio di fiabe e novelle popolari siciliane, raccolte ed illustrate da Giuseppe Pitrè.* In the notes occurred the names of Gonzenbach, Köhler, and many

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

others, then unknown to the reader. These he eagerly looked up and acquired, and embarked on a study which has been the delight and consolation of a long life. It would have been well worth while if it had led only to a long intercourse with two such noble scholars as Reinhold Köhler and Giuseppe Pitrè.

T. F. C.

Hebbel, Ibsen and the Analytic Exposition. By T. M. CAMPBELL, Heidelberg, Winters Universitätsbuchhandlung, 1922. 93 pp. The present work is an interesting contribution to a time-honored theme. The author's purpose, as stated in the Preface, is "to give a more exact account of the so-called analytic exposition, generally supposed to have been introduced into the modern drama by Ibsen . . . and to compare the two men who first fully realized the advantages of the method in their tragedies, Hebbel and Ibsen."

In this assumption that literary criticism generally accepts Ibsen as the introducer of this method of analytic exposition, the author has built on a premise that cannot be substantiated. One can find something more than traces of the same technique in the ancient Greek tragedies, which Rudolf von Gottschall once characterized as "fifth acts of plays." He meant to imply thereby that the Greek dramatist represented but the final dénouement of earlier actions and events brought about by an inexorable fate in order to fulfill the destiny of the hero. Thirty years ago Edgar Steiger (*Das Werden des neuen Dramas*, I, 249-263) applied the same criterion to Ibsen's dramas. Here heredity and environment prove even more powerful factors in the shaping of the individual than the Greek "moyra." Both ancient and modern dramas have, then, made use of the inverted character perspective—the technique of the so-called analytic exposition—to evolve character from past events and a fixed environment. The difference between Sophocles and Ibsen in this regard is only one of degree, the modern drama laying, of course, far greater emphasis on character than on plot.

In discussing the work of the two dramatists from the angle of exposition, Professor Campbell's little book, then, restates certain facts already known, but succeeds notably in the presentation of a clear outline of the expository form as illustrated in the dramatic practice of various centuries. In comparing Hebbel and Ibsen as to the use they made of the advantages of the analytic exposition, the author gives a very interesting estimate of their relative position in the development of the modern drama. He shows what Hebbel achieved in this method when, as first of the dramatists, he beheld in the mysterious influence of environment fate at work in the formation of character. He then points to Ibsen's superior treatment of the technique of analytic exposition, particularly after

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

he had abandoned Hebbel's historical symbolization of the present in order to present types of contemporaneous society in their own garb and speech.

Professor Campbell calls attention to many similarities in the problems which the two dramatists undertook to solve. He is, nevertheless, obliged to confess that, barring a few external evidences, he cannot determine the extent to which Ibsen was indebted to his predecessor.

M. G. B.

In his work *Gesellschaftsideale und Gesellschaftsroman des 17. Jahrhunderts. Studien zur deutschen Bildungsgeschichte* (Berlin, 1921), Egon Cohn has attacked a most interesting subject, namely an interpretation of what is generally considered the most uninteresting period of modern German history and literature—the seventeenth century. The subject is especially attractive to an American scholar as a large part of the material is not accessible to him. The title would lead one to expect a work more specifically devoted to the novel, but, as the author himself acknowledges, the trend of treatment gradually changed until the novel plays the secondary rôle. The portion of the work dealing with the more general aspects of the period is by far the more valuable. Cohn conceives of the century as a period of transition in which ideas are in a state of flux although attempts are being made to establish certain ideals as fixed models for imitation and emulation. The old has not been entirely outlived, the new is not yet firmly entrenched. In general his evaluation of the century is much higher than that usually made. One might assert that too little stress is laid upon the Thirty Years' War; the writer, however, fully realizes this, in the eyes of some, vulnerable point, and attempts to justify thoroughly his position. He is prone to rambling digressions and repetitions, a weakness of which he also seems to be aware. In the treatment of the novel his method is vague, even obscure, at least in relation to the earlier part of his work. The nexus between the two parts hangs very loosely. Here is where one would have hoped for a treatment showing how the century is mirrored in the novel. In this respect the author has not been successful. The importance of foreign influence, the different phases of the novel as represented by Zesen, Grimmelshausen (whom he values much less highly than most contemporary investigators), and Weise, the religious and allegorical types—all these are discussed but they lack a consistent connection with the first part of the work and with each other. The monograph, which represents Heft 13 of the *Germanische Studien,* edited by E. Ebering, is nevertheless an important contribution and gives promise of still better things in the future from the young author.

R. B. R.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

RECENT PUBLICATIONS

ENGLISH

Ainslie, Douglas.—Adventures Social and Literary. *New York:* E. P. Dutton and Co., 1923. $7.00.

Bailey, John.—The Continuity of Letters. *New York:* Oxford University Press, 1923. $4.20.

Bendz, Ernst.—Oscar Wilde, A Retrospect. *Gothenburg:* N. J. Gumpert, 1921. 123 pp.

Biron, Sir Chartres. — Pious Opinions. *New York:* Brentano's, 1923.

Block, K. S.—Ludus Coventriae, or The Play Called Corpus Christi. Cotton Ms. Vespasian D VIII. E. E. T. S., Extra Series, No. cxx. *London:* Humphrey Milford, 1922.

Brooke, Stopford A. and Rolleston, T. W.—A Treasury of Irish Poetry in the English Tongue. *New York:* The Macmillan Co., 1923. $2.50.

Clark, Natalie Rice. — Bacon's Dial in Shakespeare, A Compass-Clock Cipher. *Cincinnati:* Stewart Kidd Company, 1922. 193 pp.

Chislett, William.—The Classical Influence in English Literature in the Nineteenth Century and Other Essays and Notes. *Boston:* The Stratford Co., 1923.

Cooper, Lane.—Two Views of Education, with Other Papers chiefly on the Study of Literature. *New Haven:* Yale University Press, 1923.

Crawford, S. J.—The Old English Version of The Heptateuch, Aelfric's Treatise on the Old and New Testament and his Preface to Genesis. Edited from all the existing manuscripts and fragments with an introduction and three appendices. E.E.T.S., Original Series, No. 160. *London:* Humphrey Milford, 1922.

Crum, Mason.—A Guide to Religious Pageantry. *New York:* Macmillan Co., 1923. 134 pp. $1.25.

Dyboski, Roman.—Rise and Fall in Shakespeare's Dramatic Art. *New York:* Oxford University Press, 1923. $0.70.

Gayley.—The Charles Mills Gayley Anniversary Papers. [University of California Publications in Modern Philology, Vol. XI.] *Berkeley, California:* University of California Press, 1922.

Gordan, Margarey and King, Marie N.—Verse of Our Day. *New York:* D. Appleton & Co., 1923.

Griffith, Reginald Harvey. — Alexander Pope, a Bibliography. Vol. I, Part 1, Pope's Own Writings, 1709-1734. *Austin, Texas:* University of Texas Press, 1922. 297 pp.

Hecht, Hans.—Daniel Webb, Ein Beitrag zur englischen Aesthetik des achtzehnten Jahrhunderts, mit einem Abdruck der Remarks on the Beauties of Poetry [1762] und einem Titelkupfer. *Hamburg-Altrahlstedt:* Henri Grand, 1920. 117 pp. M. 10.

Hopkins, R. Thurston. — H. G. Wells. *New York:* E. P. Dutton and Co., 1923. $5.00.

Jackson, Henry.—The Thomas Jefferson Bible. *New York:* Boni and Liveright, 1923. $2.50.

Kennard, Joseph Spencer.—The Friar in Fiction, Sincerity in Art and Other Essays. *New York:* Brentano's, 1923. $2.50.

Legouis, Emil.—Edmund Spenser. *Paris:* Bloud & Gay, 1923.

Mabbott, Thomas Ollive. — Politian, An Unfinished Tragedy by Edgar A. Poe. Edited from the Original Sources, etc. *Menasha, Wis.:* George Banta Publishing Co., 1923.

Minchin, Harold Christopher.—Talks and Traits. *New York:* E. P. Dutton and Co., 1923. $2.50.

Perrett, Wilfrid.—Some Questions of Phonetic Theory. Part I, Chapters I-IV. *Cambridge:* W. Heffer and Sons, Ltd., 1919. 4s. 6d. net.

—— Some Questions of Phonetic Theory. Chapter V, The Perception of Sound. *Cambridge:* W. Heffer and Sons, Ltd., 1919. 2s.

—— Some Questions of Phonetic Theory. Chapter VI, The Mechanism of the Cochlea. *Cambridge:* W. Heffer and Sons, Ltd., 1923. 2s. net.

—— Peetickay, An Essay toward the Abolition of Spelling; Being a Sequel to "Some Questions of Phonetic Theory," Part I, 1916. *Cambridge:* W. Heffer and Sons, 1920. 96 pp. 6s. net.

Phelps, William Lyon.—Some Makers of American Literature. *Boston:* Marshall Jones Co., 1923. $2.50.

Pollard, Alfred W.—English Miracle Plays, Moralities and Interludes. Seventh edition, revised, with a new section on the Interlude. *Oxford and New York:* Clarendon Press, 1923. lxxii, 250 pp. $2.85.

—— The Foundations of Shakespeare's Text. [The British Academy. The Annual Shakespeare Lecture, 1923.] *Oxford and New York:* Oxford University Press, 1923. 35 cts.

Smith, Egerton.—The Principles of English Meter. *New York:* Oxford University Press, American Branch, 1923. $4.20.

Stevenson.—The Short Stories of Robert Louis Stevenson. *New York:* Charles Scribner's Sons, 1923. $2.50.

Williams, Stanley T. — Studies in Victorian Literature. *New York:* E. P. Dutton & Co., 1923. $3.00.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

GERMAN

Basler, O. — Altsächsisch. Heliand, Genesis u. Kleinere Denkmäler, in erläuterten Textproben mit sprachlich-sachlicher Einführung. *Freiburg i. B.:* Wagner, 1923. viii + 229 pp.

Deutschländer, Leo. — Goethe und das Alte Testament. *Frankfurt a. M. u. Leipzig:* L. Staackmann, 1923. 199 pp.

Escher, Konrad.—Die "deutsche Prachtbibel" der Wiener Nationalbibliothek und ihre Stellung in der Basler Miniaturmalerei des 15. Jhdts. Mit 48 Textabb. [Jahrb. d. kunsthist. Samml. in Wien. Bd. 36, H. 2]. *Wien:* Halm & Goldmann, 1923. Pp. 47-96. Folio.

Friedrich, Hermine. — Kommentar zu Hauptmanns "Pippa" und zur "Versunkenen Glocke." *Leipzig:* Xenien-Verlag [1923]. 36 pp.

Goethe. — Briefe an Charlotte von Stein. Neue vollst. Ausg. auf Grund der Hss. im Goethe- u. Schiller Archiv. Hrsg. v. Julius Petersen. [2. Bde. in 3 Tln.] Bd. 1. 2. Tl. 1. 2. *Leipzig:* Insel-Verlag, 1923. xlii + 657; 468 pp; pp. 469-827.

Hildebrand, Sune. — Die Discourse der Mahlern. Zürich 1721-23 und Der Mahler der Sitten Zürich 1746 sprachlich verglichen. Ein Beitr. z. Gesch. d. nhd. Schriftsprache in der Schweiz. Diss. *Uppsala:* Almquist & Wiksell, 1923. xix + 129 pp.

Korff, H. A.—Geist der Goethezeit. Versuch einer ideellen Entwicklung der klass.-romantischen Literaturgeschichte. Tl. 1: Sturm u. Drang. *Leipzig:* J. J. Weber, 1923. xiii + 321 pp. M. 11.50.

Leitzmann, Albert. — Die Quellen von Schillers u. Goethes Balladen. 2. Aufl. *Bonn:* A. Marcus & E. Weber, 1923. 64 pp. M. 0.80.

Martin, Roland. — Untersuchungen zur rhein-moselfränkischen Dialektgrenze. [Deu. Dialektgeographie. H. 11a]. *Marburg:* Elwert, 1922. vi + 128 pp.

Petrich, Herm.—Ernst Moritz Arndt und das Kirchenlied des letzten Jahrhunderts. *Berlin:* Schriftenvertriebsanstalt, 1923. 8 pp.

—— Paul Gerhardt und die Blüte evangelischen Kirchenliedes. *Berlin:* Schriftenvertriebsanstalt, 1923. 8 pp.

Rohr, F.—Parzival und der Heilige Graal. Eine neue Deutung der Symbolik der Graldichtungen. *Hildesheim:* F. Borgmeyer [1923]. 420 pp. M. 8.

Schenkel, Wilh.—Hermann Löns' "Zweites Gesicht." Eine Studie. 4.-7. Tausend. *Berlin:* Deutsche Landbuchhandlung, 1922. 70 pp.

Schneider, Georg.—Handbuch der Bibliographie. *Leipzig:* K. W. Hiersemann, 1923. xvi + 544 pp. M. 10.

Thomése, Ika A. — Romantik und Neuromantik mit bes. Berücksichtigung Hugo von Hoffmannsthals. *The Hague:* M. Nijhoff, 1923. 197 pp. Fl. 4.

Tronchon, Henri.—La Fortune intellectuelle de Herder en France. La Préparation. Thèse pour le doctorat. *Paris:* F. Rieder & Cie., 1920. 570 + 70 pp.

Ulmann, Hanns.—Das deutche Bürgertum in deutschen Tragödien des 18. u. 19. Jhs. [Diss. Giessen]. *Elberfeld:* Hofbauer, 1923. 74 pp.

Von deutscher Art und Kunst. Einige fliegende Blätter. Getreu nach dem i. J. 1773 bei Bode in Hamburg ersch. Erstdruck in Faks. hrsg. v. H. Kindermann. *Wien:* Stephenson [1923]. xx + 182 pp., 6 plates. Boards, M. 7.—

Wahl, Hans.—Die Dornburger Schlösser. Zum 28. August. 1923. [Schriften d. Goethe-Ges. Bd. 36.] *Weimar:* Goethe-Ges. 1923. 43 pp. 4°.

Weise, Oskar.—Die deutsche Sprache als Spiegel deutscher Kultur. Kulturgeschichtliche Erörterungen auf sprachl. Grundlage. *Jena:* Frommann, 1923. viii + 175 pp.

Wolff, Walter. — Technik und Dichtung. Ein Überblick über 100 Jahre deutschen Schrifttums. *Leipzig:* E. Oldenburg [1923]. 173 pp.

FRENCH

Bearman, E. C. — Translation from and into French. *New York:* Dutton, 1923. 93 pp. 75 cts.

Bernard, T.—L'Anglais tel qu'on le parle, ed. by T. E. Hamilton. *New York:* Oxford Press, 1923. 80 cts.

Chardenal, C. A.—Complete Fr. Course. Phonetic ed. *New York:* Allyn and Bacon, 1923. xl + 51 pp. $1.60.

Champion, P.—Histoire poétique du quinzième siècle. *Paris:* Champion, 1923. 2 vols. xi + 395 + 474 pp.

Chinard, G.—Volney et l'Amérique. *Baltimore:* Johns Hopkins Press, 1923. 206 pp. [Johns Hopkins Studies in Romance Literatures and Languages I.]

Collection Gallia. — Balzac, la Recherche de l'Absolu (250 pp.); Mme de Girardin, la Canne de M. de Balzac (201 pp.); E. and J. de Goncourt, Soeur Philomène (188 pp.); Scribe, Maurice (205 pp.). *New York:* Dutton. 75 cts. each.

Draper, F. W. M.—The rise and fall of the French Romantic drama. *New York:* Dutton, 1923. 315 pp. $6.

Dawson, E.—Henry Becque. La Vie et son Théâtre. *Paris:* Payot, 1923.

Erlande, E.—Un jeune légionnaire, ed. by V. E. François. *New York:* C. E. Merrill, 1923, 160 pp. 60 cts.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

Feugère, A.—L'Abbé Raynal and Bibliographie critique. Thèse and thèse comp. *Angoulême:* Impr. ouvrière, 1922. 458 and 99 pp.

Grauer, K. A.—Practical French course. *Milwaukee:* Casper, 1923. 44 pp. $1.

Guibert d'Andrenas, ed. by J. Crosland. *New York:* Longmans, 1923. 110 pp. $1.35.

Handschin.—Methods of teaching modern languages. *Yonkers:* World Book Co., 1923. 484 pp. $2.40.

Hatzfeld, H.—François Rabelais. *Munich:* Rösl, 1922. 236 pp.

Henke, W.—Die Verwendung phantastischer u. okkulter Motive in der Erzählungsliteratur H. de Balzacs. Diss. *Greifswald:* 1922.

Lecompte, I. C.—Le Roman des romans, an Old French Poem. *Princeton:* University Press, 1923. xxxiii + 67 pp. (Elliott Monographs.)

Leeman, J.—Paris pittoresque. *Boston:* Allyn and Bacon, 1923. 205 pp. $1.20

Lowe, L. F. H.—Gérard de Nevers, a study of the prose version of the Roman de la Violette. *Princeton:* University Press, 1923. 72 pp. (Elliott Monographs.)

McKenzie and Hamilton. — Elementary French Grammar. *New York:* Century, 1923. xi + 295 pp. $1.50.

Pugh, A. R.—Michelet and his ideas on social reform. Diss. *New York:* Columbia University Press, 1923. 277 pp. $2.

Schnurer, H. — Les jugements littéraires de Michelet. Diss. *Paris:* Soc. gén. d'impr., 1923. 108 pp.

Schück, H.—Allmän litteraturhistoria. IV: Den franska klassiciteten. *Stockholm:* Gebes, 1922. Kr. 12.50.

Sóltoft and Ballard. — Children's French. *Yonkers:* World Book Co., 1923. xii + 168 pp.

Stewart and Tilley.—The classical movement in French Literature traced by a series of texts. *New York:* Macmillan, 1923. 174 pp. $2.40.

Vaillant, R. — Exercises on Balzac's Eugénie Grandet. *Boston:* Heath, 1923. iv + 54 pp. 48 cts.

Vincent, F. — Le Travail du Style chez Saint François de Sales. Diss. *Paris:* Beauchesne, 1923. 115 pp.

Wacher, P.—A. de Musset u. die Musik. Diss. *Greifswald:* 1922. 76 pp.

ITALIAN

Arina, I.—Pensieri su Dante. *Salerno:* Tip. del Commercio, 1923. 33 pp. L. 2.

Ariosto, Lodovico.—Orlando Furioso. Introduzione e note di Filippo Ermini. Vol. I. *Torino:* Unione tipografico-editrice, 1923. 363 pp. L. 12. (Collezione di classici italiani con note, VII.)

Berni.—Rime del —, e di berneschi del secolo XVI, con introduzione e commento di Gino Saviotti. *Milano:* F. Vallardi, 1923.

Bertoldi, V. — Un Ribelle nel regno de' Fiori. I nomi romanzi del Colchicum autumnale L attraverso il tempo e lo spazio. *Firenze:* Olschki, 1923. vii + 224 pp. L. 30.

Cocchiara, G.—Popolo e canti nella Sicilia d' oggi (girando val Demone). *Palermo:* R. Sandron, 1923. 163 pp. L. 7.

Cojazzi, A.—Manzoni apologista. *Torino:* Soc. ed. Internazionale, 1923. vii + 445 pp. L. 15.

Geisow, H.—Von Goethe zu Dante. *Stuttgart:* W. Hädecke, 1923. 136 pp.

Giusti, G.—Vita, scritta da lui medesimo, raccolta e pubblicata da G. Biagi. *Firenze:* Le Monnier, 1923. vii + 158 pp. L. 4. (Nuova Biblioteca nazionale.)

Guidetti, G.—L'amicizia, la religione e la lingua nelle relazioni e carteggio tra Antonio Cesari, Alessandro Manzoni e Giacomo Leopardi. *Reggio Emilia:* U. Guidetti, 1923. xx + 340 pp. L. 7.

Luiso, F. P.—Un documento inedito lucchese che interessa la biografia di Dante. *Lucca:* Coop. tip. ed. Lucchese, 1921. 13 pp. (Per nozze Sardi-Mazzei.)

Malattia Della Vallata, G.—Villotte friulane moderne (amorose, sociali, storiche, filosofiche e letterarie) con uno studio su Dante in Friuli, ecc. *Maniago:* "La Tipografica," 1923. viii + 256 pp. L. 12.

Mariani, Egle.—Dante. *Napoli:* Tip. S. Graziano e figlio, 1922. xlvii + 568 pp. L. 30.

Merlo, C. — Fonologia del dialetto della Cervara. *Roma:* Maglione e Strini, 1923. 111 pp. L. 18. (Dialetti di Roma e del Lazio. Studi e documenti pubblicati in memoria di E. Monaci. Vol. II.)

Mignon, M. — Les affinités intellectuelles de l'Italie et de la France. *Paris:* Hachette, 1923. Fr. 12.

Momigliano, A.—Primi studi goldoniani. *Firenze:* Perrella, 1923. 91 pp. L. 4.

Parodi, E. G.—Il Canto II del "Paradiso" letto nella Sala di Dante in Orsanmichele. *Firenze:* G. C. Sansoni, 1923.

Pisani, Maria.—Un avventuriero del quattrocento. La vita e le opere di Benedetto Dei. *Napoli:* Soc. ed. F. Perrella, 1923. 120 pp. L. 15. (Biblioteca della "Rassegna," V.)

Porena, M.—Il pessimismo di Giacomo Leopardi. *Napoli:* Soc. ed. F. Perrella, 1923. 77 pp. L. 10. (Biblioteca della "Rassegna," III.)

Portal, E.—L'Arcadia. *Palermo:* R. Sandron, 1923. 184 pp. L. 8.50. (Collezione settecentesca.)

Praga, M.—Cronache teatrali, 1922. *Milano:* Fratelli Treves, 1923. 290 pp. L. 9.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

Ronzoni, D.—Dante Alighieri frate regolare. De penitentia tertii ordinis Sancti Francisci. *Perugia:* Unione tipografica cooperativa, 1922. 18 pp.

Serafini, M.—L'arte, le contraddizioni, il pessimismo del Leopardi. *Modena:* Tip. Immacolata Concezione, 1922. 15 pp.

Steiner, C. — Nel cinquantenario della morte di Alessandro Manzoni. Discorso commemorativo tenuto il XXIII maggio MCMXXIII nel salone del r. conservatorio G. Verdi di Milano. *Piacenza:* Soc. tip ed. Porta, 1923. 40 pp. L. 2.

Vossler, C.—Letteratura italiana contemporanea. *Napoli:* Ricciardi, 1923. 2a edizione con aggiunte. 176 pp.

SPANISH

Amezúa y Mayo, A. G. de.—Fases y caracteres de la influencia de Dante en España. *Madrid:* Editorial Reus, 1922. 79 pp.

Aragó, Juan.—Spanische Grammatik zum bes. Gebrauch in deutschen Schulen Spaniens und Südamerikas sowie in den Handelsschulen Deutschlands. Herausgegeben vom Deutschen Schulverein Barcelona. *Freiburg i. B.:* Bielefeld, 1923. viii + 263 pp.

Bell, A. F. G. — Benito Arias Montano. *Oxford:* University Press, 1923. 5sh. (Hispanic Notes and Monographs, Essays, Studies, and Brief Biographies issued by the Hispanic Society of America. Spanish Series, V.)

De Poncet, E.—El último de su raza. With vocabulary and notes. *Boston:* Stratford, 1923. 185 pp. $1.50.

Espronceda, José de.—El Estudiante de Salamanca. Notes of E. Allison Peers. *Cambridge:* University Press, 1922. 64 pp. (Cambridge Plain Texts, II.)

Etchegoyen, G. — L'amour divin. Essai sur les sources de Sainte Thérèse. *Bordeaux:* Feret et fils, 1922. (Bibliothèque de l'Ecole des Hautes Etudes Hispaniques de Bordeaux, fasc. IV.)

Fitzmaurice-Kelly, J. — Antonio Pérez. *Oxford:* University Press, 1923. 7sh. 6d. (Hispanic Society of America.)

Goldschmidt, Th.—Enseñanza objetiva de lenguas extranjeras. La lengua española enseñada por la intuición y la vista, sin auxilio de la lengua propia. *Leipzig:* F. Hirt, 1922. 103 pp.

Henríquez Ureña, P.—En la orilla. Mi España. *México:* Edit. México Moderno, 1922. 167 pp. $2.00.

Lemos, G. — Barbarismos fonéticos del Ecuador. Suplemento a la Semántica ecuatoriana. *Guayaquil:* E. A. Uzcátegui, 1922. 160 pp.

Llano Roza de Ampudia, A. de.—Dialectos jergales asturianos. Vocabularios de la "xíriga" y el "bron." *Oviedo:* Tip. de "El Correo de Asturias," 1921. 19 pp.

Manfred, M. E.—Practical Spanish Grammar for Beginners. *New York:* Scribner, 1923. 455 pp. $1.48.

Mendoza, Diego Hurtado de.—Guerra de Granada contra los moriscos. Herausgegeben von Adalbert Hämel. *Bielefeld:* Velhagen und Klasing. 1923. viii + 128 pp. (Sammlung spanischer Schulausgaben, 1.)

Moratín, L. F. de. — El sí de las niñas. Comedia en tres actos. Mit Einl. u. Anm. hrsg. von Richard Ruppert y Ujaravi. *Heidelberg:* J. Groos, 1923. vii + 111 pp. (Neuere spanische Schriftsteller, 2.)

Pardo, L. L. — The Key to the Spanish Language. *New York:* Criterion Syndicate, 1923. 115 pp. $1.50.

Rodríguez, Marín, F. — Quijotesco cartel de desafíno en El Toboso, el año de 1641. Sácalo a nueva luz en el aniversario CCCVI de la muerte de Cervantes, un devoto de este peregrino ingenio. *Madrid:* Tip. de la "Revista de Archivos," 1922. 20 pp.

Silvela, F.—Artículos, discursos, conferencias y cartas. Notas de Félix de Llanos y Torriglia. Tomo I. *Madrid:* Mateu, Artes Gráficas, 1922. 4to., 461 pp.

Spanish. Its Value and Place in American Education. A Symposium of Authoritative Opinion. Issued by the Committee on Information of the American Association of Teachers of Spanish. *Stanford University, Cal.:* Stanford University Press, 1923. 88 pp.

GENERAL

Armstrong, E. C.—A. Marshall Elliott, a Retrospect. *Princeton:* University Press, 1923. 14 pp. (Elliott Monographs.)

Gardner, George and Nicholson, Sydney A.—Manual of English Church Music. *New York:* Macmillan Co., 1923. 232 pp. $4.00.

Haskins, Charles Homes. — The Rise of Universities. *New York:* Henry Holt & Co., 1923.

Ingersoll, Ernest.—Birds in Legend, Fable, and Folklore. *New York:* Longmans, Green and Co., 1923. $3.00.

Kelemina, Jakob. — Geschichte der Tristansage nach den Dichtungen des Mittelalters. *Wien:* E. Hölzel, 1923. xv + 232 pp. Kr. 85000.

Kilpatrick, William Heard.—Source Book in the Philosophy of Education. *New York:* The Macmillan Co., 1923. 365 pp. $2.25.

Report of the Joint Committee on Grammatical Nomenclature. Revised ed. *Washington:* Nat. Ed. Ass., 1923. 75 pp. 25 cts.

Vossler, Karl.—Gesammelte Aufsätze zur Sprachphilosophie. *München:* Hueber, 1923. viii + 272 pp.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

Volume XXXIX MARCH, 1924 Number 3

MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES

EDITED BY

JAMES WILSON BRIGHT, Editor-in-Chief

GUSTAV GRUENBAUM WILLIAM KURRELMEYER

H. CARRINGTON LANCASTER

CONTENTS

CLARK, H. H.—A Study of Melancholy in Edward Young, Part I, - - - 129
KAYE, F. B.—Mandeville on the Origin of Language, - - - - - 136
MARTIN, H. M.—Lope de Vega's 'El Vellocino de Oro' in relation to its Sources, - - - - - - - - - - - - - - 142
PIERCE, F. E.—Blake and Seventeenth Century Authors, - - - - 150
TILLEY, M. P.—Good Drink makes Good Blood, - - - - - - 153
KRAPPE, A. H.—A Byzantine Source of Shakespeare's 'Othello,' - - 156
BELDEN, H. M.—'The Jew's Daughter' and the Myth of Zagreus, - - 161

Reviews:—

P. BOISSONNADE, Du Nouveau sur la *Chanson de Roland*. [*D. L. Buffum.*] 166
C. F. WARD, *Le Livre de la déablerie*. By Eloy D'Amerval. [*Grace Frank.*] - - - - - - - - - - - - - 173
PAUL FRIEDRICH und FRITZ EBERS, Das Grabbe-Buch. [*E. H. Zeydel.*] 175
ALICE J. DUBREUIL, The Novel of Democracy in America. [*C. S. Northup.*] 178
GERHARD MOLDENHAUER, Herzog Naimes im altfranzösischen Epos. [*H. E. Haxo.*] - - - - - - - - - - - - - 180

Correspondence:—

EVANS, G. F., An Overlooked Sonnet, - - - - - - - - 184
WOODBRIDGE, B. M., Bel Ami and Madame Walter, - - - - - - 185
MORRIS, MURIEL, A Note on Wordsworth and Vaughan, - - - - 187
TRACY, T. F., A Source of Anatole France: Benvenuto Cellini, - - 188

Brief Mention:—

J. MELANDER, *Guibert d'Adrenas*; JESSIE CROSLAND, *Guibert d'Adrenas*;—PERCY H. HOUSTON, Doctor Johnson, a Study in Eighteenth Century Humanism, - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - 190

THE JOHNS HOPKINS PRESS
BALTIMORE

Eight Numbers a Year — Single Copy (Current) Sixty-five Cents

Entered as Second-Class Matter at the Baltimore, Maryland, Postoffice

Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103, Act of October 3, 1917. Authorized on July 3, 1918

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

[M]ODERN LANGUAGE NOTES

A MONTHLY PUBLICATION with intermission from July to October (inclusive)

[T]his publication is devoted to linguistic and literary research and to [aes]thetic and philosophic criticism in the domain of English, German, and [the] related Germanic Languages; and of French, Italian, Spanish, and the [oth]er Languages of the Romance Group. Its purpose is also to promote [sou]nd methods in the teaching of the Modern Languages and Literatures.

The Subscription Price of the current annual volume is $5.00 for the United States and Mexico; Canada $5.25 and $5.50 for other countries included in the Postal Union.

[C]ontributors and Publishers will please address matter for the English Department [of the] *Notes* to James W. Bright; for the German Department to William Kurrelmeyer; [for th]e French Department to H. Carrington Lancaster; for the Italian and Spanish [Depar]tments to Gustav Gruenbaum. Other matter may be sent to the Editor-in-Chief. [The a]ddress of all the editors is Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md.

Subscriptions and other business communications should be sent to the Johns Hopkins [Pr]ess, Baltimore, Md.

PREPARATION OF COPY

All copy should be in typewritten form.

Underscore (for italics) all titles of books, periodicals, poems, plays and other [sep]arately published compositions.

Use numerals in designating foot-notes, and number foot-notes in unbroken sequence.

Use roman numerals for volume-reference, set off by a comma before a following page-[refer]ence.

WORDSWORTH: Lectures and Essays

BY H. W. GARROD

A most profound and brilliant study of the poet that will be a real and lasting contribution to Wordsworth literature. The style of the book throughout is delightful. *Net* $2.50

THE CONTINUITY OF LETTERS

BY JOHN BAILEY

A selected group of essays and lectures, dealing with some aspects of the English literature of the last three centuries, which will appeal to all lovers of literature. *Net* $4.20

SOME AUTHORS

BY SIR WALTER RALEIGH

An important collection of literary essays which have become obscure by being buried in old periodicals or in large and costly editions, treating of Boccaccio, Don Quixote, Robert Burns, Shelley, Matthew Arnold, Whistler, Burke, and others, with several published for the first time. *Net* $5.00

THE ART OF POETRY

BY WILLIAM PATON KER

Contents: The Art of Poetry; Shelley; *Samson Agonistes;* Romantic Fallacies; Pope; Molière and the Muse of Comedy; Matthew Arnold. $2.00

THE NOVELS OF JANE AUSTEN

EDITED BY R. W. CHAPMAN

A large paper edition, limited to 1000 sets, with notes, indexes, and illustrations from contemporary sources, 7 collotypes (6 in colour), 38 half-tone plates, and several illustrations in the text. The illustrations are from drawings and prints of the period, which Miss Austen might have seen. The binding of the marbled boards, with cloth backs and paper labels, is likewise in the style of the Regency. Five Volumes. *Net* $35.00

OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS

American Branch

35 WEST 32ND STREET, NEW YORK

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

Modern Language Notes

VOLUME XXXIX MARCH, 1924 NUMBER 3

A STUDY OF MELANCHOLY IN EDWARD YOUNG

Part I

In glancing at the melancholy which preceded Young, it is interesting to notice its close relation to solitude. Quite appropriately, Francis Petrarch, the first romantic poet, is noted for his melancholy; this, however, is only a corollary to his love of solitude, his egoism, his extreme desire for fame, and his hypersensibility. Along with other things Petrarchian, melancholy was imported by the English Renaissance. The fact that Roger Ascham gave its nosology and Ben Jonson described some virulent cases, indicates that it had become a fashionable disease by the time of Elizabeth. Shakespeare's Jacques, the first complete study of melancholy, is remarkable for his modern qualities: his melancholy is different from that of anyone else,—it is his master-passion, his original genius; and he is vain of his excellent and affected differences.[1]

Richard Burton, in his exhaustive treatment of the subject, notes the relation of melancholy to solitude, and the fact that it was often cultivated for its own sake and for its atmosphere of distinction.[2] Representing, as he does, the confluence of the Petrarchian and Elizabethan types, Burton is important as having suggested [3] to Milton two poems of great influence in later romanticism—*L'Allegro* and *Il Penseroso*. The latter poem, filled with

[1] *As You Like It*, IV, 1 ff.

[2] "Nullum solum infelici gratius solitudine, ubi nullus sit qui miseriam exprobet." (*Anatomy of Melancholy*, Pt. I. Sec. 2, Mem. 2. Subs. 6.)

[3] By the prefatory stanzas to the *Anatomy of Melancholy*. These were written about 1601, or twenty years before the completed work.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

the spirit of Cambridge and sweet contemplation, represents melancholy as being induced by solitude.[4] But after Milton for nearly a hundred years melancholy was evidently tabooed; the shadow of the grave and the mystery of the future were shunned by the rational Augustans. In 1721, however, Thomas Parnell[5] restored melancholy to literature, and, quite characteristically, a melancholy closely related to solitude; another element also appeared in Parnell which was significant for later romanticists,—namely the tendency to ruminate upon the futility of ambition and the certainty of death. Thus the Petrarchian and Elizabethan type of melancholy merge into nascent romanticism in the early eighteenth century. And by 1729, when Savage's *Wanderer* came out, sorrow had become sentimentalized and blended almost completely with the earlier melancholy; sorrow, too, had become hopelessly tangled with solitude.[6]

Young's *Night Thoughts,* published 1742-44, were rewarded with immediate and great popularity, and serve as an index to the taste, and therefore the character, of an important period of transition. And Young is especially qualified to serve as such an index, for in time of poetic change the transition from the older themes and styles to the new is best studied in poets of mixed achievement and middle rank; he was partly of the past and partly of the future—like the lion of his master Milton, he was always "pawing to get free his hinder parts." Although continuing the literary conventions of the melancholy which had gone before and which was to become so distinct a note in later romanticism, there is a still deeper undertone in the poetry of the graveyard than in the literature which preceded or followed; it was very characteristic of Young that he should have carried his melancholy to extremes. Considered in its historical relations, his type of melancholy represents a transition to the sentimentalism which resulted from the philosophy of Shaftesbury and Rousseau, of which Richardson's

[4] The poem is composed of five solitary situations. Melancholy, in the invocation, is represented as the daughter of Solitude and Purity, or, perhaps, of Solitude and Genius.

[5] *A Hymn to Contentment* and *A Night-Piece on Death.*

[6] Cf. Canto 2: "Had not an innate grief produced thy woes,
Men, barbarous men, had preyed on thy repose."
Sorrow thus provides an excuse for indulging the desire for retiring from the world.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

Clarissa Harlowe (1748),[7] Sterne's *Sentimental Journey* (1768), and MacKenzie's *Man of Feeling* (1771), are examples.[8] Furthermore, Young's work contains the seeds of many significant tendencies which reached fruition in the great romantic poets later,—for instance, his subjective tone, his vague aspiration and escape from the present, his fondness for solitude and gloomy meditation, and his doctrine of original genius with all its consequences. Nevertheless, *Night Thoughts* is a kind of hybrid poem, still didactic and argumentative in substance, in spite of the new romantic elements.

The causes of Young's melancholy may be divided into two classes. Under the first we shall consider his life, with its sorrows and disappointments; under the second, his philosophy with its bearing on melancholy.

A study of Young's life leads to the conclusion that a natural predisposition to depression, the complement of his subjective and egotistical nature, was aggravated by deep sorrow and worldly disappointment. We are told that even in his college days he preferred to compose after midnight by the light of a candle stuck in a skull. And it was just after college that Young's thoughts were turned toward death and

> "The grave, his subterrenean road to bliss,"

by the death of William Harrison with whom he enjoyed a friendship not unlike that between West and Gray or that between Hallam and Tennyson. In *The Epistle to Lord Lansdowne,* 1713, Young laments for his friend, "the partner of his soul."[9] Notwithstanding repeated efforts to win preferment and fame, "in his thirty-fifth year, . . . his prospects were no higher than in 1708."[10] Later, to be sure, with the publication of the *Night Thoughts* he enjoyed no inconsiderable fame, but apparently never in the measure which his egotistical nature craved. To return to his early work, however, we find little of importance, save the fact,

[7] A warm friendship existed between Richardson and Young, and the latter was loud in his praise of his friend's work.

[8] In the *Man of Feeling* Mr. Henry Morley finds fifty outbursts of tears, and he did not bother to count the sobs. Weeping became the infallible sign of virtue.

[9] Line 509.

[10] Henry C. Shelley: *Life and Letters of Edward Young* (Boston), 1914, page 40.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

as M. Thomas has pointed out, that even in his youthful days he was "le poète de la pensée mélancholique."[11] In 1727 Young abandoned a career of playwright, attended with very meagre success, for the church; in 1730, at the age of forty-four he was appointed Rector of Welwyn, where he retired, disappointed with his failure to win the attention he thought he deserved, and henceforth "peeped at the world through the loopholes of retreat." Doubtless his priestly duty of comforting those who mourned, and his preoccupation with religious and moral treatises, tended to make his life more sombre. In 1740[12] his wife died, followed, within three months, by his step-daughter and her husband, Mr. Temple.[13] "Of all these losses," writes Mr. Shelley, "the one which affected him the most deeply was that of his wife; that was the culminating burden of his sorrows, having issue in sleepless nights and melancholy days."[14]

Furthermore, there can be little doubt that his melancholy was increased by his solitary habits and by the surroundings which he chose to remind him of the transitory nature of human life. It is unnecessary to repeat the story of the alcove in his garden where he had a bench painted to give the illusion of reality, bearing the words "Invisibilia non decipiunt," or the fate of the sun-dial inscribed, "Eheu fugaces!" His last years were lonely,—and melancholy.[15] "While his health permitted him to walk abroad, he preferred a solitary ramble in his churchyard to exercise with a companion on a more cheerful spot."[16] It was thus almost inevitable that pondering upon graveyards should lead to reflections upon the futility of ambition and the mutability of all things.

However, in extracting possible sources of melancholy from the poet's life, as I have done, there is danger of giving a distorted view. To outward appearance his life was not as melancholy as I

[11] W. Thomas; *Le Poete Edward Young* (Paris), 1901, page 316.

[12] Shelley, *ibid.*, p. 147 says Young's wife died Oct. 1736. Had he read Thomas, *op. cit.* p. 144, he would have seen that her death did not occur until Jan. 29, 1740. Thus *Night Thoughts* were begun soon after her death.

[13] Mr. Temple has been identified as Philander in *Night Thoughts.*

[14] Shelley: *ibid.*, page 147.

[15] Sir Leslie Stephen: *D. N. B.*, Vol. XXI, 1286. "Young's last years were melancholy."

[16] Rev. J. Mitford: *Life of Young*, lvii, in *The Poetical Works of Edward Young* (Boston), 1854.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

may have suggested. Mr. Shelley very properly emphasizes the pleasanter side of Young's life, especially the fact that he entertained guests occasionally and could be witty in society. The truth of the matter is probably given in the words of his own son: "He was too well-bred a man not to be cheerful in company, but he was gloomy when alone; he was never cheerful after my mother's death, and he had met many disappointments." [17] And we have already seen, and we shall see more clearly later, that he preferred solitude,—not so much, perhaps, a physical solitude, as a psychic solitude due to a certain intellectual isolation from his fellows. However, not to mention the good fortunes which were Young's, many people have suffered far greater sorrows than his and have lost neither their cheerfulness nor serenity of spirit. A more profound source of his depression must be sought, therefore, and for that purpose we shall turn to his philosophy of life. Granting that a man's fitness for the world in which he lives and his harmony with the laws of the universe are attested, not by a state of melancholy, but of happiness, we can find few more serious indictments against a view of life than that it ultimately leads to melancholy. Would it not be of considerable ethical value, if we could ascertain the fundamental causes—some of them, at least,—of melancholy, in order that they might be more intelligently avoided?

True happiness, it is probably safe to say, results chiefly from a mediation between extremes. The great problem of man is one of adjustment and compromise between various interests of the life here and now in order that a portion of each may be enjoyed. Discipline and restraint are essential in order to insure the moderation and proportion which a mediation between extremes implies. This, inadequately expressed as it is, was the essence of the teaching of Aristotle and, in part, of Plato; this represents the humanistic doctrine of the golden mean. Conversely stated, failure to mediate between extremes and compromise between the interests of the life before us is probably the principal cause of unhappiness or melancholy.[18] And it is precisely a failure of this sort which,

[17] Rev. J. Mitford: *ibid.*, lxi.

[18] It may be objected that melancholy is not the exact negative of happiness. Inasmuch as our interest is philosophical rather than technically pathological, the above equation of terms is approximate enough to serve our purpose.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

in my opinion, underlies most of the melancholy found in Edward Young. I shall attempt to show that his whole philosophy of life may be grouped around a choice of extremes as a nucleus; if this attempt is successful it will provide a new and unified interpretation of a man of no little importance in the early history of romanticism.

The *first* cause of the poet's melancholy, considered now as a result of his philosophy of life, is his disdain for the world in which he lived; and this is essentially the result of his inability to mediate between extremes. He believed that a choice must be made between this world and the next; there was apparently no possibility of adjusting and harmonizing the values of both.

> "Religion's all. Descending from the skies
> To wretched man, the goddess in her left
> Holds out this world, and in her right the next." [19]

And Young, being obliged, as he thought, to choose one—to go to one extreme or the other—chose the "next."

> "The Visible and Present are for brutes,
> A slender portion, and a narrow bound!
> These Reason, with an energy divine,
> O'erleaps, and claims the Future and Unseen;
> The vast Unseen, the Future fathomless!" [20]

Inasmuch as this exultation in the "Future fathomless" is characteristic of Young, and is somewhat misleading at times, it is perhaps relevant to criticise it here. There is a profound significance in the fact that Wordsworth, who, as Mr. Elton says,[21] was practically the only romantic poet free from melancholy, sought to live in no "Utopia," "subterranean fields," or "secreted island, Heaven knows where!"

> "But in the very world, which is the world
> Of all of us,—the place where, in the end,
> We find our happiness, or not at all!" [22]

Wordsworth is perhaps too dogmatic here, for surely some of the great religious teachers of the world have stressed other worldli-

[19] *Night Thoughts*, IV, 550-52.

[20] *Ibid.*, VI, 246-50.

[21] O. Elton: *Survey of English Literature, 1780-1830*, Vol. II, p. 95.

[22] *Prelude*, Bk. XI.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

ness without sacrificing happiness. But the point is that Young's religion is for the most part hollow: he tends to substitute passive emotional revery under the midnight skies for active spiritual meditation—spiritual idleness for spiritual activity—while at the same time he disdains the world where he might still have found happiness. This must be constantly borne in mind, lest we be deceived by his "endless speculation" in "bliss remote."

His attitude toward the world in which he lived is clear; he has described it in no equivocal terms—this "miry vale";[23] this "nest of pains";[24] "this dark, incarcerating colony";[25] "this night of frailty, change, and death";[26] "this dismal scene";[27] this "vapour";[28] this "prison";[29] this "pestilential earth."[30]

He is obsessed with the conviction that joy—such as may be had on earth—is but an illusion which intensifies our gloom.

> "Life's gayest scenes speak man's mortality."[31]
> "Who would be born to such a phantom world,
> Where nought substantial but our misery?
> Where joy (if joy) but heightens our distress,
> So soon to perish, and revive no more?
> The greater such a joy, the more it pains."[32]

His melancholy is able to extract nourishment from the strangest materials. This is illustrated in his long sermon upon Narcissa[33] in the *Night Thoughts*. Her youth should remind us that death may come to us at any moment; her gayety, that the approach of death may be disguised; and her fortune, that one should guard against wealth distracting our thoughts from the grave. Life is dismal and ambition futile; he longs for the day, all too remote, when

[23] *Night Thoughts*, IV, 537.
[24] *Ibid.*, III, 409.
[25] *Ibid.*, IV, 665.
[26] *Ibid.*, IV, 555.
[27] *Night Thoughts*, III, 363.
[28] *Ibid.*, VIII, 138.
[29] *Ibid.*, IX, 1019.
[30] *Ibid.*, IX, 1352.
[31] *Ibid.*, IX, 65.
[32] *Ibid.*, VII, 964-58.
[33] The controversy in regard to the identity of Narcissa has probably been brought to a close by the research of Mr. Horace W. O'Connor. In the publication of *The Modern Language Association*, March, 1919, p. 149, he concludes his study as follows: "We are justified, it seems to me, in discarding the theory of an illegitimate daughter and adopting that which sees in the incident an unacknowledged borrowing poetically fused with material from the writer's own experience."

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

". . . . . . Final Ruin fiercely drives
Her ploughshare o'er Creation." [34]

But why was the world so melancholy? Obviously, from what has been said, his grief is one reason. His conception of original genius, emphasizing the quest of novelty, furnishes a second reason. He has been expostulating with Lorenzo upon the shocking thought of a continued existence on earth, when he concludes:

". . . . . . With laboring step
To tread our former footsteps? pace the round
Eternal? to climb life's worn, heavy wheel,
Which draws up nothing new? to beat, and beat
The beaten track? to bid each wretched day
The former mock? to surfeit on the same,
And yawn our joys? or thank a misery
For change, though sad?" [35]

It is evident here and elsewhere that *ennui* resulting from an exasperated quest of novelty tends to mould his view of life: he longs to escape into an "empire of chimeras" forever new and wonderful. Still a third reason for his attitude toward his social environment may be found in his disillusionment resulting from the fact that "he never obtained the preferment to which he thought himself entitled." [36] These are a few of the reasons why he sought consolation in solitude, which, under the influence of nature, was supposed to inspire virtue and wisdom.

Harry H. Clark.

Harvard University.

MANDEVILLE ON THE ORIGIN OF LANGUAGE

The student who wishes to enquire into the early history of linguistic theory will easily discover in our historians of philology a multitude of references. Among these references, however, very few are to writers who speculated in anything resembling a modern manner concerning the origin of speech. Grammarians and phi-

[34] *Night Thoughts*, IX, 167-169.
[35] *Ibid.*, III, 329-36.
[36] Sir Leslie Stephen: *D. N. B.*, Vol. XXI, 1285.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

lological metaphysicians occupied in tracing the *development* and *present structure* of language are recorded by whole congregations, but of scientific speculation concerning the *origin* of speech there is very little noted earlier than Condillac's *Essai sur l'origine des connoissances humaines* (1746) and Herder's *Abhandlung über den Ursprung der Sprache* (1770).[1] Because of this lacuna in our histories and because of the need of a background for the matters later to be considered, I begin with a list of the writers before Condillac who have anticipated modern speculation concerning the genesis of language—a list which, for all its brevity, is, I believe, somewhat more ample than is to be found elsewhere. It should be noted, however, that this catalogue is intended to include only those who theorized from something like the modern point of view; the usual theological and metaphysical disputants are of no pertinence here.[2] And mention is not made of anticipations of less than a certain degree of definiteness.[3]

The list is necessarily a short one. The Greeks neglected the problem of prehistoric evolution, debating instead (as in Plato's *Cratylus*) whether words were φύσει or θέσει—the inevitable reflection of their respective objects, or arbitrarily established by convention or the gods.[4] Such few anticipations of modern enquiry into the origin of language as antiquity offers are to be found in those works which speculate realistically concerning the rise of society—in Lucretius (bk. 5), Horace (*Satires* I. iii), Diodorus Siculus (I. i), and Vitruvius (II. [33] i); as well as Gregory of Nyssa in his answer to Eunomius's second book (*Contra Eunomium, Lib. xii,* in Migne, *Patrologia Græca,* xlv (1858) 1044-5). In more modern times, till the middle of the eighteenth century, there seems to be little more. That language is not the gift of Providence, rapidly and self-consciously elaborated,

[1] It won the prize of the Königliche Akademie der Wissenschaften of Berlin that year.

[2] For example, I do not include Laurent Joubert's *Question vulgaire: quel langage parleroit un enfant qui n'auroit jamais ouï parler* (1578) or Montaigne's use of Joubert (*Essais,* ed. Bordeaux, 1906-20, ii. 166-7), for these writers held with the theologians that man speaks because of an inborn specific instinct for language.

[3] Thus I omit such very slight anticipations of modern speculation as that by Hobbes, *Leviathan,* pt. 1, ch. 4 and *De Homine,* § 2, ch. 10.

[4] Cf., for instance, Jesperson, *Language* (N. Y., 1922), p. 19.

Digitized by Google
Original from
UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

but is something developed by savage man through slow ages of halting and undeliberate evolution—that was a vision forbidden by theological prepossessions and the attendant lack of our modern feeling for evolution. The few writers who held language to be a product of human invention were forced by biblical chronology and the belief in a speaking Adam to suppose the self-conscious invention and rapid elaboration of language rather than the slow evolution postulated by modern scholars.[5] Richard Simon, it is true, recognized clearly that language was invented and developed by man (*Histoire critique du vieux testament,* Amsterdam, 1685, pp. 84 sqq.), but his feeling for evolution was mainly for the development *following* the achievement of language rather than for that *preceding* it; and, in any case, his analysis is merely tentative when compared to speculation after Condillac. Locke quite missed the evolutionary aspect of the matter, considering words as arbitrarily invented (*Essay concerning human understanding* III. iii. 1). Leibniz (*Nouveaux essais* III. i-ii), though recognizing the fact of language-development, lacked strong feeling for the tentativeness, accidents, and difficulties of its original appearance, and the great slowness of its growth. Vico (*Scienza nuova*) was a romantic etymologist.

So much for the chief pioneers in this field before Condillac—except for one writer, in some ways the most precocious—although he has been totally overlooked by our historians of philology. On 17 December 1728, appeared Part II of Bernard Mandeville's celebrated *Fable of the bees.*[6] Some ten pages of this work are devoted to a surprisingly modern discussion of man's achievement of language. These passages merit the historian's attention.

Mandeville held that man, although probably the only animal capable of rational speech, was, when still completely savage, 'not only . . . destitute of Language,' but likewise ignorant that he 'stood in need of any; or that the want of it was any real Inconvenience . . . ' (*Fable* ii. 285 and 190).[7] Moreover, even

"if Savages, after they are grown Men and Women, should hear

[5] Cf. Sapir, 'Herder's "Ursprung der Sprache"', in *Modern Philology* v (1907). 112-13.

[6] Cf. the *Daily courant* for 17 and 19 Dec. 1728, and the *Daily post* for 18 Dec. 1728.

[7] I cite the *Fable* in my forthcoming edition (Clarendon Press).

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

others speak, be made acquainted with the Usefulness of Speech, and consequently become sensible of the want of it in themselves, their Inclination to learn it would be as inconsiderable as their Capacity; and if they should attempt it, they would find it an immense labour, a thing not to be surmounted; because the Suppleness and Flexibility in the Organs of Speech, that Children are endued with, and which I have often hinted at, would be lost in them; and they might learn to play masterly upon the Violin, or any other the most difficult musical instrument, before they could make any tolerable Proficiency in speaking" (ii. 285).

Yet, though with no instinct for language (ii. 286) and unable to develop it deliberately, primitive man could yet make himself understood:

"When a Man's Knowledge is confin'd within a narrow Compass, and he has nothing to obey, but the simple Dictates of Nature, the Want of Speech is easily supply'd by dumb Signs; and it is more natural to untaught Men to express themselves by Gestures, than by Sounds; but we are all born with a Capacity of making ourselves understood, beyond other Animals, without Speech: To express Grief, Joy, Love, Wonder and Fear, there are certain Tokens, that are common to the whole Species. Who doubts that the crying of Children was given them by Nature, to call Assistance and raise Pity, which latter it does so unaccountably beyond any other Sound? . . . Weeping, laughing, smiling, frowning, sighing, exclaiming, we spoke of before. How universal, as well as copious, is the Language of the Eyes, by the help of which the remotest Nations understand one another at first Sight, taught or untaught, in the weightiest temporal Concern that belongs to the Species? and in that Language our wild Couple would at their first meeting intelligibly say more to one another without guile, than any civiliz'd Pair would dare to name without blushing" (ii. 286-7).

Since, therefore, primitive man was not only unfitted for speech but felt no need for it, its rise was very slow; and Mandeville several times stressed this fact: '. . . a dozen Generations proceeding from two Savages would not produce any tolerable Language . . .' (ii. 190). At length, however, language was born—

"By slow degrees . . . and length of time. . . . From what we see in Children that are backward with their Tongues, we have reason to think, that a wild Pair would make themselves intelligible to each other by Signs and Gestures, before they would attempt it by Sounds: But when they lived together for many Years, it is very probable, that for the Things they were most

Digitized by Google
Original from
UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

conversant with they would find out Sounds, to stir up in each other the Idea's of such Things, when they were out of sight; these Sounds they would communicate to their young ones; and the longer they lived together the greater Variety of Sounds they would invent, as well for Actions as the Things themselves: They would find that the Volubility of Tongue, and Flexibility of Voice, were much greater in their young ones, than they could remember it ever to have been in themselves: It is impossible, but some of these young ones would, either by Accident or Design, make use of this superior Aptitude of the Organs at one time or other; which every Generation would still improve upon; and this must have been the Origin of all Languages, and Speech it self . . . " (ii. 287-8).

Mandeville added some further consideration of the survival and effect of gesture, including the ingenious conjecture that 'the Strength and Beauty of our Language' is due partly to the fact that our refraining from much gesture and emphasis has forced the English language to supply by its vocabulary and idiom the forcefulness which Latin races secure from their delivery (ii. 290-2).

Although at present overlooked, it is possible that Mandeville's speculation concerning the origin of speech had important consequences, for both Condillac and Herder may have been indebted to him. Condillac's *Essai sur l'origine des connoissances humaines* appeared in 1746, six years after the *Fable* had achieved a French translation and while it was at the height of its vogue—a vogue so great that most educated men may be presumed to have known the book.[8] What makes me suspect indebtedness by Condillac for that part of the *Essai* (pt. 2, § 1, ch. 1) where the origin of language is treated is that he agrees so closely with Mandeville's very unusual discussion, most of the analysis in the *Essai,* barring its systematic exposition and its appeal to what psychologists call 'association.' being in the *Fable.* Thus Condillac expresses the idea that primitive men could converse without language through cries and gestures, aided by the fact that sympathy tends to arouse in the beholder the emotions which cause the gestures and the exclamations (*Essai,* in *Œuvres,* ed. 1798, i. 261-2 and *Fable* ii. 285-7). He sets forth the inability of primitive men to use lan-

[8] Concerning the truly enormous vogue of the *Fable* see my edition, introduction, ch. 5, or my article "The Influence of Bernard Mandeville," in *Studies in Philology* XIX (1922). 86-89.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

guage, because of their stupidity and the stiffness of their tongues (*Œuvres* i. 261 and 265 and *Fable* ii. 285-6). He mentions the slowness and accidental nature of the development of language (*Œuvres* i. 265-6 and *Fable* ii. 288). And he enlarges upon the use, forcefulness, and persistence of gesture (*Œuvres* i. 266-70 and *Fable* ii. 287-90). Even for such a detail as Condillac's remark (*Œuvres* i. 266) that gesture, because of its very usefulness as a means of intercourse, was a hindrance to the growth of language there is a hint in the *Fable* (ii. 291-3). But the most significant resemblance between the *Essai* and the *Fable* is in a point which both books make central—that children, because of the superior flexibility of their tongues, were largely the creators of new words. Condillac writes:

"Ce couple eut un enfant, qui, pressé par des besoins qu'il ne pouvoit faire connoître que difficilement, agita toutes les parties de son corps. Sa langue fort flexible se replia d'une manière extraordinaire, et prononça un mot tout nouveau. Le besoin continuant donna encore lieu aux mêmes effets; cet enfant agita sa langue comme la première fois, et articula encore le même son. Les parens surpris, ayant enfin deviné ce qu'il vouloit, essayèrent, en le lui donnant, de répéter le même mot. La peine qu'ils eurent à le prononcer fit voir qu'ils n'auroient pas été d'eux-mêmes capables de l'inventer.

"Par un semblable moyen, ce nouveau langage ne s'enrichit pas beaucoup. Faute d'exercice, l'organe de la voix perdit bientôt dans l'enfant toute sa flexibilité. Ses parens lui apprirent à faire connoître ses pensées par des actions, manière de s'exprimer, dont les images sensibles étoient bien plus à sa portée que des sons articulés. On ne put attendre que du hasard la naissance de quelque nouveau mot; et, pour en augmenter, par une voix aussi lente, considérablement le nombre, il fallut sans doute plusieurs générations" (*Œuvres* i. 265-6. Cf. the passage from the *Fable* cited above, pp. 139-40).

Herder's celebrated *Abhandlung über den Ursprung der Sprache* does not show any of the specific parallels to the *Fable* which Condillac's enquiry offers. It agrees with the *Fable* merely in its general attitude, taking the still unorthodox naturalistic view of the origin of speech. It is only, therefore, as regards this attitude that the question arises of indebtedness to Mandeville; and it should be noted at once that, if Herder's general inspiration was derivative, it could easily have come from others than Mandeville—from Condillac, for instance, whom Herder cited and criticized.

Digitized by Google
Original from
UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

Yet it is worth remarking that a German translation of Part II of the *Fable* appeared in 1761, some nine years before Herder finished his *Abhandlung*; that this translation had for title *Anti-Shaftsbury,* and thus might well have at once attracted the notice of so ardent a Shaftesburian as Herder even if the fame of the *Fable* and Herder's omnivorous reading in German and English literature had not by themselves made him familiar with it; and, finally, that, in 1802, Herder reviewed the *Fable* at length in *Adrastea.* To be sure, even if these considerations indicate indebtedness to Mandeville, the debt seems unlikely to have been more than slight. Still, there is the chance that Mandeville may have furnished a clue and a stimulus while Herder's opinions were gestating.[9]

In any event, both as a possible source of the speculation of Condillac and Herder, and as one of the pioneers of modern theory concerning the origin of language, Mandeville seems deserving of a place in the history of philology.

Northwestern University. F. B. Kaye.

LOPE DE VEGA'S *EL VELLOCINO DE ORO* IN RELATION TO ITS SOURCES

In 1622 Lope de Vega dramatized the legend of the Golden Fleece for representation at the festival of Philip IV given at Aranjuez on May 15th of that year.[1] His treatment[2] as compared with the treatment of the same subject by the classical authors is markedly peculiar. The basic features of the legend as they are found almost without variation in surviving classical literature are: The usurper Pelias promised Jason the kingdom rightfully his, if he should bring to Thessaly the golden fleece resting on an oak in the kingdom of Aeetes in Colchis. Jason sailed to Colchis in the Argo. With the aid of Medea's magic arts he yoked

[9] As early as 1765 Herder makes two specific references to Mandeville's *Fable of the Bees* in the essay *Haben wir jetzt noch das Publikum . . der Alten.* Cf. Suphan's ed. of Herder, I, 24 f. W. K.

[1] Menéndez y Pelayo, *Obras de Lope de Vega,* publicadas por la Real Academia Española, Madrid, 1896, VI, Int., p. lii.

[2] *L. c.,* VI, 149 f. The remaining references to Lope will be to volume VI of the Academy edition, and the numbers will correspond to page, column, and line.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

the fire-breathing bulls, plowed the field, and sowed dragon's teeth. Then, seizing the fleece from the sleeping dragon, he took it along with his benefactress to Greece. These elements Lope combined and elaborated with such freedom that an inquiry is pertinent into the connection of his play with its Medea prototypes. He himself suggests Ovid [3] as his source, but numerous variations from the conventional plot [4] prove him to have been free from slavish imitation at least. In the first place, he has interwoven the Phrixus and Helle myth with the myth of the Argonautic expedition. This association is not found in the work of any classical author of repute. He has created a semblance of unity, however, between the two stories by interrelating their personages through affairs of the heart and introducing into the Medea romance the multiple love plot,[5] also foreign to the classical version.

According to the ancient conception, Jason is upon his arrival in Colchis ignorant of Medea's existence, and only turns gradually to her, partly under the seductive influence of her beauty, partly for reasons remote from sentiment.[6] Lope introduces the idea that Jason already knowing of Aeetes's marriageable daughter announced to Phineus at the moment of disembarking his willingness to marry her for services rendered.[7] Again the classical authors state that an artisan called Argus constructed the first ship at the suggestion and under the guidance of Pallas or Hera and Pallas.[8]

[3] "Aquella historia que canta | Ovidio, de donde tuvo | Principio el Tusón de España," 151, 1, 25. See the statement of Menéndez y Pelayo, *l. c.*, VI, Int., p. lxii: "Lope de Vega, según su costumbre, tomó por guía a Ovidio." The reference to Ovid is: *Met.*, 7, 179 f.; *Her.*, 12.

[4] Additional possible sources are: Apollodorus, *Bibl.*, 1, 9, 16 f.; Ap. Rhodius, *Argon.*; Hyginus, *Fabulae*, 3, 14, 21, 22; Val. Flaccus, *Argon.* Other writers who deal primarily with the jealous and avenging Medea are: Pindar, *Pythian Odes*, 4; Euripides, *Medea*; Seneca, *Medea*. *Cf.* Menéndez y Pelayo, *l. c.*, Int., p. lxii. For a fuller bibliography see *Argonautica of Ap. Rh.*, Geo. A. Mooney, London, 1912, Int., p. 16; Pauly-Wissowa, *Real-Encyclopädie*, II, 748.

[5] Fenisa, Medea's lady-in-waiting, is in love with Theseus, and he with her; Silvia, in reality Helle, with Phineus, while he is infatuated with Medea, his own cousin.

[6] Ap. Rh., 3, 528; Val. Fl., 7, 413 f.

[7] "Y en esta empresa me ayuda, | Yo me casaré con ella," 160, 2, 6 f.

[8] Apoll., 1, 9, 16, 6; Ap. Rh., 1, 18; Hyg., *Fab.*, 14; Val. Fl., 1, 91 f.; Pauly-Wissowa, *l. c.*, II, 751.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

Here Lope's invention is much superior. A bird's nest, which, having fallen into the water, floated before the wind, suggested to Jason the idea of navigation and the means.[9] By thus allowing the action to develop free from divine interference Lope once more displayed his originality. Indeed, in only two cases has he imitated the ancient writers in admitting the gods into the action.[10] Similar self-sufficiency is observed in his description of Jason's combat with the dragon and bulls. In the classical writers nearest our own time the details vary neither in character nor in their relative order.[11] In Lope's account the logical order is found reversed,[12] since Jason subdues the dragon first and then the bulls. In the classical narrative, also, the bulls are not said to guard the fleece in so many words, but their yoking is a part of the task appointed by Aeetes as a preliminary to approaching the coveted treasure. In Lope's account, on the contrary, they are associated with the dragon as immediate guardians.[13] The teeth sown, therefore, are the teeth of the dragon just slain,[14] not those already in the keeping of Aeetes, which were taken from the mouth of Cadmus's dragon. Finally, Jason is represented by Lope as slaying outright both dragon and bulls;[15] elsewhere, with practical unanimity, the former is said to have been rendered inert by Medea's soporific offering, the latter to have been left subdued but unscathed.

[9] "Se cayó un nido de un árbol," 160, 29.

[10] Mars appears to Phrixus (155, 1, 1), to accept the fleece, which he offers; to Jason (169, 1, 29), immediately before the double contest with the beasts, in order to promise the fulfilment of his ambition.

[11] Jason yokes the bulls, plows the field, sows the teeth, awaiting the result, and finally snatches the fleece from the sleeping dragon.

[12] See 169, 2, 28. There were originally two versions. All recent writers on classical soil, that is to say, those likely to have been available to Lope, placed the contest with a fleece-guarding dragon at the end of the threefold task (*cf.* Pauly-Wissowa, *l. c.*, II, 765, 766; Müller, H. D., *Mythologie der griechischen Stämme*, Göttingen, 1861, II, 312 f., 340 f.). It is a matter to be explained that Lope should have reverted to the earlier versions.

[13] *Cf.* 160, 2, 45; 161, 1, 12; 165, 2, 6; 169, 2, 20.

[14] *Cf.* 169, 2, 30. This detail, also, is found in the older version.

[15] "Cayeron, Teseo amigo," 6, 170, l. 3. The dragon is said to be slain in the oldest form of the myth (Pauly-Wissowa, *l. c.*, II. I, 766), and it is so related by Pindar and Euripides (*Pyth.*, 4, 249; *Med.*, 480); Ovid, however, writes the reverse (*Met.*, 7, 118 and 149).

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

To the serene carelessness with which Lope combined incidents to form his plot may be traced several illogical situations. Apparently the tasks prescribed by Aeetes for any one who might desire to gain the fleece formed a series of increasing difficulty. The surmounting of the first two obstacles was a necessity for coming within range of the fleece at all. If the order of the tasks be transposed, however, while the conventional setting is kept, the detail of sowing the teeth becomes irrelevant. For let it be borne in mind that Aeetes in stating to Jason the terms for winning the fleece had omitted this condition altogether (*cf.* 160, 2, 42). Evidently Lope failed to see its uselessness, because Jason is made to perform the strange act of sowing, although he had not previously plowed the field.[16] Furthermore, the bulls can be associated with the dragon as joint protectors of the fleece only with some sacrifice of verisimilitude, because they cannot in strict logic be thought of as remaining quiescent while Jason was slaying the hideous serpent. Finally, Jason's admiration for a sorceress should be akin to fear. The classical poets, aware of the incongruity existing in the situation, rightly in their portraiture mingled respect with Jason's love, and respect which bordered on fear.[17] Lope, it must be said, omitted so nice a detail of character-drawing owing perhaps to the fact that Ovid did not insist on the point ("nunc tibi visa nocens," *Her.*, 12, 7). Such flaws in construction, though trivial, indicate that the Spanish dramatist did not follow in a careful way any closely reasoned account.

The foregoing particulars in which Lope departed from the beaten path[18] concern plot. In certain details of characterization, also, his heroine is unique. She is a Spanish maiden of his own day.[19] There are, accordingly, a resolution and promptness in her

[16] *Cf.* 169, 2, 34 f.

[17] "Tantus subiit nam virginis horror," Val. Fl., 8, 67; *cf.* Ap. Rh., 4, 149.

[18] Additional trivial deviations: (a) Medea blinds Phineus temporarily by the exercise of her magic art (166, 2, 2). (b) Helle has an uneventful voyage to Colchis, where she serves as *trota-conventos* between Medea and Jason. (c) Theseus, and not Mopsus or Telamon, is Jason's boon friend and companion. According to Apollonius of Rhodes (1, 101), Theseus remained at home. Hyginus (*Fab.*, 14) includes him in the list of heroes. (d) The tree in which the ram's skin is preserved is a bay-tree, and not an oak (Ovid, *Her.*, 12, 67; Pauly-Wissowa, *l. c.*, II, 766).

[19] Léon Mallinger, *Médée*, Paris, 1898, p. 216.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

decisions which we miss in the vacillating heroine[20] of Ovid and Flaccus. She is worldly-wise, too, and familiar with the fickleness of men,[21] a depiction which contrasts sharply with the untutored Medea whom we know in the classical versions. Above all, she displays that gravity and dignity of bearing which have come to be considered Spanish traits. With the Greek and Roman poets the prevailing motivation is of a womanly, if somewhat assertive, type. Lope's Medea, also, although markedly aggressive, is neither wanton nor vicious. Only under dire stress does she employ her demonic powers to injure.[22] On the other hand, Lope has cast her in an inflexible mold. She directs, she wooes, and is not abashed; lacking in softness, she is critical and even scornful.[23] And he has left her deficient in feminine modesty, which in other writers only the intervention of the gods was sufficient to break down. The same writers represent her as both filial and a lover of country[24] ("dum licet, effuge crimen," Ovid, *Met.*, 7, 71). In Lope's heroine these ideas are all too faint. Fear of punishment alone gives her pause.[25]

The preceding list of additions to, and omissions from, the familiar plot has shown to what a degree Lope recast it. It is further apparent that the emphasis in the seventeenth-century production has been entirely shifted. Little interested in the temptation of Medea and her palpitating struggle before suc-

[20] *Cf.* Ovid, *Her.*, 7, 47; Val. Fl., 7, 143, 144, and *passim.*

[21] *Cf.* 165, 2, 31. Other writers, and in particular Ovid, make much of her innocence, which she taunts Jason with having betrayed. *Cf.* Ovid, *Her.*, 12, 93 and 120; Val. Fl., 5, 354; 7, 227.

[22] Even then their use or effect is only inferred from Jason's marvelous victory, Medea being neither audibly nor visibly present at the crisis; *cf.* 170, 1, 1.

[23] *Cf.* 155, 2, 42; 156, 1, 1 and 16 f.; 156, 2, 38; 157, 2, 39. "Aborrecido amante," etc., 156, 1, 42.

[24] The classical writers portray Medea as loath to sacrifice her modesty and to betray her country (Ovid, *Met.*, 7, 10, 38, 69; Val. Fl., 7, 222, 310). But the gods undermine her resistance. Then, yielding, she tosses on her couch, a prey to remorse (Ovid, *Her.*, 12, 58; Val. Fl., 7, 10, 140, 313). Nor do these writers fail to exculpate her lapse on the ground that she is youthful and unable to cope with the fell alliance of the gods, whose power like an inexorable fate drives her on for the satisfaction of their own private ends ("Et formosus eras, et me mea fata trahebant," Ovid, *Her.*, 12, 35; "puellae simplicis," *Her.*, 12, 35; "trepidam," Val. Fl., 5, 391, "inscia," 6, 660).

[25] "Porque, si me dejas sola, | Todos me darán la muerte," 165, 2, 37.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

cumbing, Lope is still less interested in revealing the psychological niceties of her mental condition while so engaged. The capture of the fleece by Jason is his ultimate dramatic goal, and to it he proceeds at vigorous pace, untempted to dally on the path. The names of Jason's companions in adventure might have been found in Hyginus or Apollodorus.[26] Again, we may recognize Pindar or Euripides in a single detail in the combat with the dragon, while the description of the double encounter is identical with that found in the oldest writers. Yet it is not necessary to suppose, nor is it probable that Lope actually consulted any of these writers. Neither is there any trace of the influence of Apollonius of Rhodes or Flaccus, who unfold so meticulously the love and the intense struggle of their heroine. The author was familiar with other accounts in classical literature, but used perhaps only the two of Ovid, and especially that contained in the *Metamorphoses*. Even these he followed afar and in the most perfunctory way, freely supplementing and amending. The substance of Medea's longest and most important utterance (162, 1, 48 f.) is clearly derived from *Met.*, 7, 25-50.[27] Nevertheless, in the sphere of rhetoric only is his indebtedness to Ovid absolute, as the scintillating dialogue in many places suggests. The form of the argumentation and the graceful phrasing here and there are, also, characteristically Ovidian. In its present form, therefore, Lope's plot is a synthesis furnished by clothing the skeleton of Ovid's narrative with details gained from other sources. Some of these minutiae he invented.[28] Others came originally from the storehouse of classical mythology.

[26] Lope mentions only two of Jason's companions, Theseus and Lidorus (168, 2, 6). Theseus is included in the lists given by Hyginus (*Fab.*, 14) and Apollodorus (1, 9, 16, 8). Lidorus's name appears in no list. Lope, therefore, probably selected both on his own authority. *Cf.* Pauly-Wissowa, *l. c.*, II, 751; Roscher, *Lex.*, I, 508.

[27] Direct imitations are rare. The following have been noted: "Si finge que se enamora | Jasón y quiere en su tierra | Otra mujer," 162, 2, 52; "Porque, si me dejas sola, | Todos me darán la muerte," 165, 2, 37; "Que si yo le obligo tanto, | El se casará conmigo," 162, 2, 43. Compare with these in order: "Si facere hoc, aliamve potest praeponere nobis, | Occidat ingratus," *Met.*, 7, 42, 43; "poenae Medea relinquar," *Met.*, 7, 41; " . . . Tibi se semper debebit Iason | Te face sollemni iunget sibi," etc., *Met.*, 7, 48.

[28] "La acción, subordinada, como tenía que estarlo, á las máquinas, decoraciones, danzas, músicas y tramoyas." Menéndez y Pelayo, *l. c.*, p. lxii.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

But in spite of Lope's profound knowledge of myths, which his excellent training in Latin had assured, it is not possible that he could control by sheer act of memory so vast an array of classical lore as his plays represent. We must, therefore, look elsewhere for the immediate source of his additions to Ovid.

Circumstances point to Boccaccio's *Genealogia Deorum*,[29] or a lineal descendant of it. This manual yields the necessary particulars. The information contained under *Jason* (XIII, XXVI) and *Medea* (IV, XII) corresponds in almost every respect with the main incidents as Lope narrates them. Even the peculiar order of events in the contest itself is that adopted by Lope.

Moreover, the following particulars, omitted by Ovid, are found both in Boccaccio and Lope: Argus is mentioned as the builder of the ship; the expatriation of Phrixus and Helle is told at some length;[30] Pelias's fierce jealousy of Jason and its consequences are described.[31] While, on the other hand, in direct opposition to Ovid, both assert the actual death of the dragon[32] and the dispersion of its teeth to produce the harvest of warriors. Hence, perhaps, Lope's correspondence previously mentioned with the older version.

The assumption that Lope made use of Boccaccio's handbook in this play would be strengthened if similar cases can be found in some of his other classical plays. Such evidence is furnished by *Adonis y Venus*, *El Perseo*, and *La Bella Aurora*. In describing the infatuation of Hippomenes for Atalanta, Ovid emphasizes that its beginning was caused by the sight of her in the race, her exertions in which only served to accentuate her physical charm. Boccaccio states that Hippomenes met her by chance and, dazzled by her radiance, wished immediately to enter the race as a means of winning her. He is exactly followed in his treatment of the point by Lope.[33] At the termination of the Andromeda story, and at a point in the narrative beyond which Lope closes his account,

[29] On the diffusion and reputation of Boccaccio's manual *cf.* Hutton, E., *Boccaccio*, London, 1910, p. 248. See, also, Hauvette, H., *Boccace*, Paris, 1914, p. 424 f., Koerting, G., *Boccaccio*, Leipzig, 1880, p. 722.

[30] Lope, 153, 1, 34 f.; Bocc., XIII, LXVIII.

[31] Lope, *ibid.*, 159, 2, 28 f.; Bocc., XIII, XXVI.

[32] Boccaccio might have gleaned the detail from Servius (see on *Georgics*, 2, 240), whom he frequently cites, and he in turn from Pindar or Euripides.

[33] Ovid, *Met.*, 10, 575; Bocc., *l. c.*, X, LVII; Lope, *Adonis y Venus*, 17, 1, 12.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

Ovid speaking through Perseus casually mentions that the three Gorgons had one eye in common ("unius partitas luminis usum," *Met.*, 4, 775). Boccaccio's statement presents the substance of Ovid's, but with unimportant additions ("et vetere testante fama inter omnes tres unum tantum oculum habuere: quo utebantur vicissim," *Gen.*, X, x). Curiously enough, Lope reproduces Boccaccio's additions almost verbatim.[34] And more convincing correspondence yet is noted at one point in *La Bella Aurora.* Ovid writes that Aurora so transformed the appearance of Cephalus that he was able to enter Athens unrecognized and, presenting himself as a stranger to Procris, his wife, gained her consent to his advances by means of gifts (*Met.*, 7, 723). The motive was his own mad jealousy. Boccaccio, on the other hand (*l. c.*, XIII, LXV), says that, in order to comply with Aurora's suggestion to test the chastity of his wife, Cephalus appeared before her disguised as a merchant.[35] Lope has taken over the merchant episode,[36] and refers to the silks and jewels which the supposed vender had for sale. And he distinctly states that, because Procris recognized the likeness to her husband beneath his disguise, she yielded her honor to the spell of his memory rather than to feminine weakness for gifts.[37] Such coincidences, for the most part minute, between Lope and Boccaccio do not furnish conclusive proof of interdependence, but the aggregate is suggestive. The inference is that Lope in writing his plays on classical subjects followed Ovid in the large, but scanned the items of some handbook[38] from time to time in quest for something novel.

University of Illinois. HENRY M. MARTIN.

[34] "Las hermanas de Medusa, | que tienen, *dice la gente*, | Un ojo sólo en la frente. . . . | *Éste se puede quitar* | *y se presta entre las dos.*" *El Perseo*, 89, 1, 20.

[35] "A la puerta un mercader, | Dice que te quiere ver." *La Bella Aurora*, 231, 1, 10.

[36] Menéndez y Pelayo (*l. c.*, Int., p. lxxiv) refers to this embellishment of the Ovidian narrative as a possible Oriental reminiscence ("Ingeniosa y bien imaginada es la escena, . . . situación que parece reminiscencia de varios cuentos orientales").

[37] "Yo, no porque fuese | Codiciosa de ellas | Mas porque el retrato, | El rostro y presencia | De mi esposo vía." 233, 2, 40.

[38] The idea is not new, but the writer has never seen proof of the claim adduced, nor specific instances mentioned. *Cf.* Schevill, R., *Mod. Phil.*, IV, 224; Menéndez y Pelayo, *l. c.*, Int., p. xxvi.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

BLAKE AND SEVENTEENTH CENTURY AUTHORS

Our records of what Blake did or did not read are very scanty, and discussions of his probable sources must often resolve themselves into guess-work. If likenesses occur between his poems and those of some earlier period they may indicate direct borrowing or merely a debt on the part of both to some common source, such as the German mystic Jacob Boehme,[1] who is known to have had some influence on Milton and his contemporaries. Also we believe that original minds may occasionally arrive at marked likenesses of thought and expression by sheer chance. The following parallelisms indicate possibility of borrowing, rather than certainty. Their value, however, lies less in their evidence about sources than in the fact that they may throw some light on Blake's attitude and meaning.

Among his poems, there are few of which the interpretation is involved in more uncertainty than *The Crystal Cabinet*. In Thomas Browne's *Religio Medici*, section XXXIX Pt. I. we find the following passage: "Every man is some months older than he bethinks him; for we live, move, have a being, and are subject to the actions of the elements, and the malice of diseases, in that other world, the truest microcosm, the womb of our mother; for besides that general and common existence we are conceived to hold in our chaos, we enjoy a being and life *in three distinct worlds*, wherein we receive most manifest gradations. In that obscure world, the womb of our mother, our time is short, computed by the moon; yet longer than the days of many creatures that behold the sun; ourselves being not yet without life, sense, and reason . . . Entering afterwards upon the scene of the world, we rise up and become another creature; performing the reasonable actions of man, and obscurely manifesting the part of divinity in us, but not in complement and perfection, till we have once more cast our secundine, that is this slough of flesh, and are delivered into the last world, that is, that ineffable place of Paul, that proper *ubi* of spirits."

In other words, the proper interpretation of the poem is proba-

[1] See M. L. Bailey, *Milton and Jakob Boehme*, New York, Oxford University Press, 1914.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

bly that given long ago by the early editors. It is an imaginative picture of

> "hints and echoes of the world
> To spirits folded in the womb";

and the "three-folded smile" and the "three-fold kiss returned" are anticipations of the three-fold transmigration alluded to by Browne.

Again, Blake's longer mystical poems center around four allegorical figures, Reason, Emotion, Vegetative Placidity, and Energy. Each of these is a king in a mental world; each is good in his proper sphere, bad outside of it; and the regeneration of the universe is to come through a wise coördination of them all. Blake took this idea direct from Boehme; but a similar thought, which may show Boehme's influence on Browne, occurs in the *Religio Medici,* section XIX Pt. I: "As reason is a rebel unto faith, so passion unto reason. As the propositions of faith seem absurd unto reason, so the theorems of reason unto passion, and both unto reason; yea, a moderate and peaceable discretion may so state and order the matter, *that they may be all kings, and yet make but one monarchy; every one exercising his sovereignity and prerogatives in a due time and place,* according to the restraint and limit of circumstance." Similarly Blake's *Marriage of Heaven and Hell* drew its ideas straight from Boehme; but the core of its teaching, whether inspired by Boehme or not, is given in the *Religio Medici,* section IV, Pt. II. "They that endeavor to abolish vice destroy also virtue; for contraries, though they destroy one another, are yet in life of one another." Blake said: "Without contraries is no progression." One wonders whether the mysterious and unexplained character of the hermaphrodite, which occurs repeatedly in Blake's mystical poems, has any connection with Browne's question, (section XXI, Pt. I.) "Whether Adam was an hermaphrodite, as the rabbins contend upon the letter of the text."

Another seventeenth century work which may have influenced certain little read but puzzling passages in Blake was the *Polyolbion* of Michael Drayton. Occasionally in Blake's long mystical poems, chiefly in *Jerusalem* occur orgies of geographical names, of which the following is an example (*Jerusalem,* 71):

> "And these the names of Albion's twelve sons, and of his twelve daughters,
> With their districts. Hand dwelt in Selsey, and had Sussex and Surrey,

Digitized by Google
Original from
UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

And Kent and Middlesex; all their rivers and their hills of flocks and
herds;
Their villages, towns, cities, sea-ports, temples, sublime cathedrals,
All were his friends, and their sons and daughters intermarry in Beulah,
For all are men in eternity. Rivers, mountains, cities, villages,
All are human, and when you enter into their bosoms you walk
In Heavens and Earths, as in your own bosom you bear your heaven
And earth, and all you behold, tho' it appears without it is within
In your imagination, of which this world of mortality is but a shadow.
Hyle dwelt in Winchester, comprehending Hants, Dorset, Devon, Cornwall,
Their villages, cities, sea-ports, their corn-fields and gardens spacious . . . .
Coban dwelt in Bath; Somerset, Wiltshire, Gloucestershire
Obey'd his awful voice. Ignoge is his lovely Emanation . . . .
Peachey had North Wales, Shropshire, Cheshire, and the Isle of Man . . . .
Slade had Lincoln, Stafford, Derby, Nottingham, and his lovely
Emanation Gonorill rejoices over hills and rocks, and woods and rivers."

In the twenty-third Song the *Polyolbion* gives a list of English counties more touched with humor, but similar in its personifications and patriotic sweep:

"Kent first in our account, doth to itself apply,
Quoth he, this blazon first, 'Long tails and liberty,'
Sussex with Surrey say, 'Then let us lead home logs.'
As Hampshire long for her, hath had the term of hogs.
So Dorsetshire of long, they Dorsers used to call.
Cornwall and Devonshire cry, 'We'll wrastle for a fall.'
Then Somerset says, 'Set the bandog on the bull.'
And Gloucestershire again is blazon'd 'Weigh thy wool.'"

With more poetic mood in the fourth song Drayton imagines, like Blake, that "rivers, mountains, cities, villages, all are human":

"A troop of stately nymphs proud Avon with her brings
(As she that hath the charge of wise Minerva's springs)
From Mendip tripping down, about the tinny Mine.
And Ax, no less employed about this great design,
Leads forth a lusty rout; when Bry, with all her throng
(With very madness swoll'n that she had stayed so long)
Comes from the boggy meres and queachy fens below:
That Parret (highly pleas'd to see the gallant show)
Set out with such a train as bore so great a sway,
The soil but scarcely serves to give her hugeness way.
Then the Devonian Tawe, from Dertmore decked with pearl,
Unto the conflict comes: with her that gallant girl
Clear Tworidge, whom they feared would have estranged her fall."

But the best evidence of Blake's relation to Drayton is not in

Digitized by Google
Original from
UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

separate passages; it is in the spirit and style of the whole *Polyolbion.* Blake has obviously transmuted this material in the crucible of subjective philosophy, that of Berkeley and Boehme; but what he was trying to express contained less detailed allegorical thought and more sheer poetry of nature than has usually been realized. His prayer to his muse, in connection with the passages under discussion, could not have been so different from Drayton's:

> "Direct my course so right, as with thy hand to show
> Which way thy forests range, which way thy rivers flow;
> Wise Genius, by thy help that so I may descry
> How thy fair mountains stand, and how thy valleys lie."

In general the evidence of this paper confirms our belief that Blake's poems should be interpreted in the most simple and literal manner possible, and that in the countless minor figures of his allegory we should look less for occult meanings and more for poetic associations.

Yale University. FREDERICK E. PIERCE.

GOOD DRINK MAKES GOOD BLOOD

Don Pedro: I shall see thee, ere I die, look pale with love.

Benedict: With anger, with sickness, or with hunger, my lord, not with love. Prove that ever I *lose more blood with love than I will get again with drinking,* pick out mine eyes with a ballad-maker's pen.

Much Ado about Nothing (I. i. 250).

Benedict's denial that love will ever claim him as a votary contains two false ideas, of long standing and of wide circulation in sixteenth century England, in regard to our blood. With the advance of scientific knowledge, however, both of these ideas have dropped so completely out of later thought that to-day these pseudoscientific references are unintelligible unless explained.

One of these popular physiological misconceptions is contained in Benedict's words, "lose blood with love." The meaning here is based upon the thought, common in Shakespeare, that every sigh wrung from the lover's heart costs a drop of his heart's blood. It has been noted in some of the more obvious passages in Shakespeare,[1] but not, I believe, in this one.

[1] In *Midsummer Night's Dream* (III. ii. 97), Oberon directs Puck to find Helena of Athens because,

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

The second thought of Benedict's, and the one to which I wish to call especial attention, is contained in the words, "will get again with drinking." These words contain an old belief that has not, so far as I can find, been noted in Shakespeare. Benedict's thought is that any blood that his heart may lose by reason of an occasional sigh, may easily be restored by drinking wine. For such was the belief of Shakespeare's time—and had been long before his time. John Florio in his *First Fruits* (1578), p. 27, tells us, "as Pliny sayeth," that "wine maketh good blood." And again in his *Second Fruits* (1591), p. 51, Florio quotes and translates the Italian proverb, "He that drinks wine, drinks blood, and he that drinks water, drinks fleam."

This Italian proverb in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries is found well established in English proverbial collections and in the thought of English writers. In proverbial collections later than those of Florio we find it in Thomas Draxe's *Treasurie of Ancient Adages and Sententious Proverbes* (1616), "Good wine engendreth good blood";[2] in Torriano's *Commonplace of Italian Proverbs and Proverbial Phrases* (1666), "Wine begets blood and water flegm";[3] and in H. G. Bohn's *Polyglot of Proverbs* (1857), under Italian proverbs, "Good wine makes good blood."[4]

All fancy sick she is, and pale of cheer
With sighs of love, that cost the fresh blood dear.

Again, the Queen in the *Second Part of Henry the Sixth* (III. ii. 61), would "look pale as prime-roses with blood-drinking sighs." See notes on these passages in both plays in the English *Arden Edition*.

There seems to be no survival of this bit of physiological folk-lore in the proverbial collections. However, it is found several times in that veritable mine of proverbial material, *Euphues*; and in Stephen Gosson's *School of Abuse*. *Euphues* (Croll), p. 161, My heart melteth in drops of blood; p. 88, the drops of blood (which thou canst not see) that fall from my heart enforce me to make an end of my talk; p. 341, I wish thou couldst see the warm blood that droppeth from my heart. *School of Abuse* (Arber), p. 18, But if you saw . . . how many drops of blood my heart sweats when I remember them.

[2] *Anglia*, Vol. 42, 420, No. 2430.

[3] Torriano, Giovanni, *Piazza Universale di Proverbi, or a Commonplace of Italian Proverbs and Proverbial Phrases*, London, 1666, p. 309, No. 27. On page 39, No. 24, occurs in the same work the fuller form of the same proverb, "Flesh breeds flesh, wine blood, and bread supports."

[4] P. 76.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

"Good wine makes good blood" was well established in English thought by the time of Shakespeare. As far back as the thirteenth century Bartholemew Anglicus writing on *The Property of Things* tells us that "(red) wine turneth soon to blood because of likeness that it hath with blood in liquor, savour, and colour."[5] Among Shakespeare's contemporaries the thought is fairly common. Thomas Nash employs it several times. In his *Lenten Stuff* in one place he calls for "pure wine of itself . . . that begets blood, and heats the brain thoroughly."[6] And John Lyly, who can be relied on to give us in one place or another most of the proverbs in use in his days, employs this proverb in *Campaspe* to characterize an effeminate soldier. "It is true," the soldier says to Lais, "a featherbed hath no fellow, good drink makes good blood, and shall pelting words spill it."[7]

To return to Shakespeare, I have found no other definite reference in his work to the belief that wine literally makes blood. But there is the similar idea, which is expressed in the English form of the proverb discussed, that "good wine makes *good* blood." It is in Falstaff's self-revealing reflexion upon the difference between the "sober-blooded boy," John of Lancaster, "who drinks no wine," and his brother, Prince Hal, who "manures, husbands, and tills, like lean, sterile, and barren land, with excellent endeavour of drinking good and good store of fertile sherris, the cold blood he did naturally inherit of his father."

To-day, however, good drink no longer makes good blood. Indeed, so little room is there in modern beliefs for the myths and folklore of the twilight period of the sixteenth century that it is only with the help of the records of the past that we are able to recall this forgotten belief of Shakespeare's day.

M. P. TILLEY.

Ann Arbor, Michigan.

---

[5] Quoted in Seager's *Shakespeare's Natural History* (1896), p. 345.

[6] McKerrow's *Nash*, Vol. III, p. 152. Also see McKerrow, *Index*, to *Nash*, Vol. V, for other references in Nash, and especially his note, Vol. IV, p. 378, where are given examples other than those in Nash.

[7] Bond's *Lyly*, Vol. II, p. 352, *Campaspe* (V. II. 11).

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

A BYZANTINE SOURCE OF SHAKESPEARE'S *OTHELLO*

It is a commonly accepted opinion that the source of Shakespeare's *Othello* is the seventh story of the third day of Giambattista Giraldi Cinzio's *Hecatommithi,* a collection of novelle published first in Monteregale, Sicily, in 1565, and closely modelled after the *Decamerone* of Boccaccio.[1] This supposition is not entirely free from difficulties. In the first place no English translation of Shakespeare's time is known.[2] Critics have therefore assumed that there existed such a translation, now lost, made after the French translation of Gabriel Chapuys, published in Paris, in 1584.[3] Such an assumption is of course absolutely gratuitous, and Simrock was undoubtedly right in pointing out that a genius such as Shakespeare could easily acquire a reading knowledge of one or several European tongues if he cared so to do.[4] In the second place neither the Italian original nor the French translation mention the names *Othello* and *Iago;* but it has been pointed out that the poet took those from a contemporary work entitled *God's revenge against Adultery.* Two further problems are not settled so easily and as a matter of fact have never received adequate treatment by students of the Renaissance. The source of Giraldi is unknown. Simrock conjectures that it might be based on actual facts,[5] but is unable to prove it. On the other hand, the history of Venice is by no means shrouded in darkness, and yet no Moorish general of the republic is known who can even remotely claim kinship with the hero of Giraldi's story, and it is difficult to believe that events of such importance and in which a general-in-chief and the daughter of a nobleman were involved would have been passed over in

[1] Cf. on this work Francesco Flamini, *Il Cinquecento*, Milano, s. d., p. 428. M. Landau, *Beiträge zur Geschichte der italienischen Novelle*, Wien, 1875, p. 114.

[2] Karl Simrock, *Die Quellen des Shakspeare*, Bonn, 1872, I, 176. The first English translation, by W. Parr, came out as late as 1795.

[3] Premier (et deuxième) volume des Cent excellentes nouvelles de J. G. Giraldy Cynthien . . . contenant plusieurs exemples et notables histoires, etc. mis d'italien en françois. par Gabr. Chapuys, Paris, 1583 ou 1584. There exists also a Spanish translation, published in 1590; cf. Marcelino Menéndez y Pelayo, *Origines de la Novela*, Madrid, 1905, p. xxiii.

[4] *Op. et loc. cit.*

[5] *Op. cit.*, pp. 178-179.

Digitized by Google
Original from
UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

silence by the chroniclers of the republic. Furthermore, there are some notable differences between the story of Giraldi and Shakespeare's play which should here be pointed out.

1. Giraldi knows of no elopement of the couple such as we find in the first act of the play.
2. According to Giraldi, the Moor and Disdemona live in Venice for some time happily; in Shakespeare they depart for Cyprus the very night of the elopement.
3. The scene of the murder is told absolutely differently by the two authors. In the *Hecatommithi* the Moor causes the personage designated as *alfieri* (Shakespeare's Iago) to make a noise in the ante-room and asks his wife to get up from bed to find out the cause. The soldier then murders Disdemona by stabbing her twice. The Moor rises in his turn, reproaching the dying woman with disloyalty. The corresponding scene in *Othello* is of course too well known to need recounting.

For point 2 we might most easily suppose Shakespeare to have modified the *données* of his source primarily for stage-technical reasons. The same argument might be employed as regards point 1, as here again the play improved upon the story. But what about (3)? Why should Shakespeare have deliberately discarded the dagger and Iago as the vile tool and have preferred to make his hero himself perpetrate the murder in the strange and certainly uncommon manner of choking the heroine with a pillow? No adequate answer has as yet been given to explain this remarkable change, and I hope to show in the following pages that this explanation must be sought in the existence of a version different from that of Giraldi Cinzio.

The motif of a violent passion and subsequent elopement of the girl is found frequently enough in the Italian *novella* of the Renaissance.[6] Scenes of atrocious deeds with jealousy as the only motive power are similarly common in this form of literature.[7] In my studies on the Italian short story I have not met with a combination of the two outside the story of Giraldi. Still more difficult would it be to find a tale of which the hero can in any sense be called a Moor and who is made to play the rôle of Othello. It is therefore not likely that the author of the *Hecatommithi* drew

[6] Boccaccio, *Il Decamerone*, IV, 3, 6; V, 1, 3; Sebastiano Erizzo, *Le Sei Giornate*, *avvenimento* 1.

[7] Ser Giovanni Fiorentino, *Il Pecorone*, VII, 1; Masuccio Salernitano, *Novellino*, III, 2; III, 8; Bandello, I, 10, 12, 20.

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

on another Italian *novella* still extant. There exist, however, striking parallelisms with a number of episodes of the Byzantine epic of *Digenis Akritas*[8] which I shall summarize as follows:

1. Digenis Akritas, the hero of the epic, is the son of a Moorish emir and a Byzantine lady. His origin is indicated by his name and often alluded to.
2. He becomes enamoured of the daughter of a general and governor of a neighboring province. Her name is Eudocia.
3. They elope and are pursued by the father and other relatives of the girl; a battle ensues which ends with a reconciliation of the two parties.
4. She accompanies him to the theatre of his wars, in a border land of the Empire.
5. When lying upon his death-bed he takes leave of her and kisses her; then, seized with sudden jealousy, he presses her in his arms and chokes her to death.

A few remarks may not be out of place here, as the Byzantine epic of *Digenis Akritas* is generally not well known among scholars of the Renaissance. The epic arose in the course of the tenth century, probably in Asia Minor near the border lands adjoining the empire of the Arabs. Its hero is a historical personage, a prominent Byzantine leader feared by the Moors. Quite a number of manuscripts have transmitted the epic to us, the oldest being found in Trapezunt. Another one was discovered in Italy, at Grotta Ferrata.[9] It was written in the fourteenth century. The best existing manuscript shows a gap where the death of the hero is narrated. In other versions of the epic, Eudocia dies from grief, just before her husband's end. But the folk-songs which have been collected

[8] Cf. on this work: Karl Krumbacher, *Geschichte der byzantinischen Literatur*, München, 1897, p. 827; Constantin Sathas et Emile Legrand, *Les Exploits de Digénis Akritas, épopée byzantine du Xe siecle*, Paris, 1875. A. Rambaud, *Une Epopée byzantine au Xe siecle. Revue des Deux Mondes*, 1875, juillet-août, pp. 922-946. Georg Wartenberg, *Das mittelgriechische Heldenlied von Basileios Digenis Akritis*, Programm, 1897. Emile Legrand, *Les Exploits de Basile Digenis Acritas, épopée byzantine*, Paris, 1892; *Recueil de chansons populaires grecques*, Paris, 1874, pp. 182 ff. B. Schmidt, *Griechische Märchen, Sagen und Volkslieder*, Leipzig, 1877, pp. 37-40. Ch. Gidel, *Nouvelles études sur la littérature grecque moderne*, Paris, 1878, pp. 292-302. Alfred Eberhard, *Ueber ein mittelgriechisches Epos vom Digenis, Verhandlungen d. 34. Versammlung deutscher Philologen und Schulmänner in Trier*, Leipzig, 1880, pp. 49-58.

[9] E. Legrand. *Bibliothèque grecque vulgaire*, t. VI, Paris, 1892.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

over a large part of the Greek-speaking world narrate how she was choked to death by her jealous husband who did not wish her to be possessed by any other man after his own death.[10] This variant is undoubtedly more primitive, and the extant versions of the epic are evidently due to monkish reworkers who feared that the deed might show the hero in an unfavorable light.

There can be no doubt that the epic was well known in the Byzantine empire and continued to be so until the dawn of the Renaissance in the West, as is shown by the existing manuscripts, some of which were written at a fairly late period. The existence of the manuscript found in the library of the monastery of Grotta Ferrata, in Central Italy, furthermore proves that the epic was known in Italy as well. With the ever-growing contact of the Italians and Greeks during the fifteenth century it may be regarded as certain that Western scholars came to be familiar with the contents of the poem, of which the barbarous language naturally prevented them from doing it the honor of a Latin translation. At any rate, there can be no reasonable doubt that the *novella* of Giraldi Cinzio goes back to the episodes of *Digenis Akritas* mentioned above.

While emphasizing the similarities between the Byzantine epic and Giraldi's story, it is well not to lose sight of the numerous discrepancies. In the epic it is Digenis who hears of the beauty of Eudocia and thereupon woos her, playing the lyre before her window. In the Italian story it is the girl who makes the first advances. The motif of the wonderful music which charms the girl seems to go back to the legend of King Solomon, well known in the Byzantine empire, in Western Europe, and even in Russia during the middle ages.[11] The theme fittingly called that of the initiative of woman, on the other hand, is typically Western and extremely frequent in the Old French epic.[12] It is most likely that in Italy the more Eastern motif was replaced by one more familiar to Western readers.

The most important difference between the Byzantine epic and the *novella* is the complete absence in the former of the slanderer (Shakespeare's Iago); Digenis kills his wife because he does not

[10] Legrand, *Recueil de chansons populaires*, p. 197; Eberhard, p. 52.

[11] A. Rambaud, *La Russie épique*, Paris, 1876, p. 384; M. Deutschbein, *Studien zur Sagengeschichte Englands*. I. Teil. *Die Wikingersagen*, Cöthen, 1906, p. 47.

[12] *Ibid.*, p. 33.

Digitized by Google | Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

wish her to survive his own death. It is clear that we have here to deal with an addition foreign to the Byzantine original. There can be no doubt that this addition was the work of some Italian; for none of the Greek folksongs contain the slightest trace of such an episode. The *alfieri* of Giraldi is of course the conventional traitor and slanderer, enemy of all virtue. On the other hand, it is clear, I think, that the addition under discussion alone converted the episode of the epic into a theme fitting a short story.

Comparing now the episode of *Digenis Akritas* with *Othello,* we see that they agree in the three points in which we noticed Shakespeare disregarding the version of Giraldi. In both the epic and Shakespeare the couple elope at night and are pursued by the girl's father. The old general Doukas corresponds to Old Brabantio. In both the hero takes his wife with him to the scene of his wars without further hesitation. Finally, and this is most important, both agree in the manner in which the heroine finds her death at the hands of her jealous husband. Shakespeare differs from the epic in that the battle between the hero and the pursuers has been replaced by a sort of trial at the duke's palace. He agrees with Giraldi as against the epic in that Desdemona makes the first advances to the hero (act I, sc. 3).

From all these facts it is safe, I think, to draw the following conclusions:

1. Shakespeare's *Othello* is *not* derived from Giraldi Cinzio's *Hecatommithi.*
2. *Hecatommithi,* III, 7 is not based on any historical fact, but is the successful reworking of a number of episodes of the Byzantine epic *Digenis Akritàs.*[13]
3. *Hecatommithi,* III, 7 is not the only reworking of the episodes in question; there existed in the Italy of the Renaissance still another version of the story which was in many ways more conservative and faithful to the Greek text, notably in the manner of the heroine's death.[14]

[13] The name of Desdemona, from Greek Δυσδαίμων (unfortunate) would likewise point to Byzantine origin of the story; it would rather indicate that the novelistic development of the epic episodes had begun before their migration to Italy. Giraldi is known to have used Byzantine material also for others of his *novelle*; cf. Landau, *op. et loc. cit.*

[14] The existence of such a version has long been suspected; cf. *The Tragedy of Othello,* ed. by H. C. Hart, London, 1917, p. xxxi: To some readers it will seem likely that Shakespeare had some other or fuller version of the story than the above (Giraldi's) as his material. The absence of any of his names except Desdemona is an argument in support of this.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

4. Both these versions replaced the Byzantine by a Venetian setting, the Eastern motif of the Solomon legend by the Western of the initiative of woman. Both were evidently of Italian origin.
5. Shakespeare drew on this second version; hence his play bears greater resemblance to the Greek epic than does the story of Giraldi Cinzio.

ALEXANDER HAGGERTY KRAPPE.

Flat River, Mo.

THE JEW'S DAUGHTER AND THE MYTH OF ZAGREUS

The sources of the belief in the ritual murder of a Christian child by the Jews—a belief stil held in Russia, as the trial at Kiev just before the outbreak of the recent war shows, and preserved in a fossil state even in America in the ballad of *The Jew's Daughter.*[1] —hav been thoroly investigated by a professor of theology at the

[1] Cf. *Journal of American Folk-Lore*, XIX, 293-4, two versions taken down from oral tradition in Missouri. One of them runs:

THE JEW'S GARDEN

It rained all night and it rained all day,
  It rained all over the land;
The boys in our town went out to play,
  To toss their ball around -*round* -*round*
    To toss their ball around.

Sometimes they tost their ball too high,
  And then again too low;
They tost it into a Jew's garden,
  Where no one would dare to go.

Out came the Jew's daughter, out came the Jew's daughter,
  Out came the Jew's daughter all drest,
And said to the boy, 'Little boy, come in,
  And get your ball again.'

I won't come in, I shan't come in,
  I've often heard it said
'Whoever goes into a Jew's garden
  Wil never come out again.'

University of Berlin.[2] He shows that belief in the efficacy, both therapeutic and sacrificial, of human blood is a widespread primitiv notion, especially strong in Christian Europe in the middle ages, and by no means extinct. Such a belief, combining with an instinctiv tendency to ascribe to an exclusiv, alien, and opprest cult blasfemus parodies of one's own religius mysteries, is probably sufficient to account for the varius records of ritual murder preservd in the medieval cronicles. It has not, so far as I know, been explaind why the charge does not appear until the twelfth century.[3]

The first she offered was a yellow apple,
The next was a bright gold ring,
The third was something so cherry red
Which entised the little boy in.

She took him by the lily-white hand
And led him thru the hall
Into a cellar so dark and dim
Where no one could hear him call.

She pinned a napkin round his neck,
She pinned it with a pin,
And then she called for a tin basin
To catch his life-blood in.

'Go place my prayer-book at my head,
My bible at my feet,
And if any of my playmates ask for me
Just tell them that I'm asleep.

'Go place my bible at my feet,
My prayer-book at my head,
And if any of my playmates ask for me
Just tell them that I am dead.'

[2] H. L. Strack, *The Jew and Human Sacrifice.* 8th ed., trans. by H. Blanchamp, with special preface and additions by the author. London, 1909.

[3] The killing of a Christian by drunken Jews at Inmestar in the fifth century is hardly a case in point. In the eleventh century the Jews of Chieti wer 'accused of making a waxen image of Christ, which they transpierced with knives' (H. C. Lea, *Engl. Hist. Rev.*, IV, 230), but this is not the same thing as ritual murder. The erliest recorded case seems to be that of William of Norwich in 1137. From that time the accusation

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

Once made, it was implicit in the conditions of the time, racial, social, and religius, that it shoud be repeated and shoud spred thru Christendom.

A like charge had been made against the erly Christians when they wer a secret and opprest communion in the old Roman world. Minucius Felix in the *Octavius*[4] givs a detaild account of how, according to common belief, Christian novises wer initiated by the ritual murder at their hands of an infant disguized as a lump of dough—a proceedure imagind from suggestions in some of the Dionysiac mysteries. As these mysteries undoubtedly had an influense in shaping erly Christian belief and ritual, it is not improbable that the accusation preservd in the English ballad is a reflection, coming down thru ecclesiastical tradition, of a charge formerly made against the Christians themselvs, and that its origin is therefore neither Christian nor Jewish, but pagan.

In the light of this possibility it is suggestiv to note the resemblance between the ballad, certain forms of it especially, and the

spred rapidly over western Christendom, appearing in France and Germany in the twelfth, in Spain and Switzerland in the thirteenth, and in Bohemia erly in the fourteenth century; in Italy not til the fifteenth.

[4] Cap. 8 (p. 13 in the Teubner ed.). Felix was the erliest Latin Christian apologist; the *Octavius* is dated by Baehrens circ. 162. It is an essay in dialog form, reflecting a temper curiusly like that of the author of the *Letter on Enthusiasm*, and wel worth reading. Some of the remarks put into the mouth of Octavius fit modern conditions (as reveald in Strack's account of certain doings in eastern Europe in the nineteenth century) very neatly. It appears (cap. 28) that the Christians wer accused of all sorts of indecencies and obscenities, as wel as absurdities, e. g. worshipping an ass's hed. 'Quis tam stultus,' says Octavius, 'ut hoc colat? Quis stultior, ut hoc coli credat?' And he understands very wel the sycology of these accusations (cap. 27): 'Ideo inserti mentibus imperitorum odium nostri serunt occulte per timorem; naturale est enim et odisse quem timeas et quem oderis infestare, si possis.' Fear playd its part, as wel as policy and greed and fanaticism, in the medieval prosecutions. The Hugh of Lincoln story in the Annals of Burton as recounted by Child (111, 236) represents that 'the information given by his playmates as to when and where they had last seen him roused a strong suspicion among the Christians that he had been carried off and killed by the Jews; all the more because there were so many of them present in the town at that time, and from all parts of the kingdom, though the Jews pretended that the occasion for this unusual congregation was a grand wedding.'

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

Greek myth of Zagreus as gatherd by Miss Harrison [5] from Clement of Alexandria and others:

'The infant god variosly called Dionysos and Zagreus was protected by the Kouretes or Korybantes who danced around him their armed dance. The Titans desiring to destroy him lured away the child by offering him toys, a cone, a rhombos, and the golden apples of the Hesperides, a mirror, a knuckle-bone, and a tuft of wool. The toys are variously enumerated.[6] Having lured him away they set on him, slew him, and tore him limb from limb. Some authorities add that they cooked his limbs and ate them. Zeus hurled his thunderbolts upon them and sent them down to Tartarus. According to some authorities, Athene saved the child's heart, hiding it in a cista. A mock figure of gypsum was set up, the rescued heart placed in it, and the child brought thereby to life again. The story was completed under the influence of Delphi by the further statement that the limbs of the dismembered god were collected and buried at Delphi in the sanctuary of Apollo.'

It is a curius coincidence, if it is nothing more, that in the ballad [7] (not, I believ, in the cronicle records) the boy is entised, as he is in the Zagreus myth, by a series of offerings.

Further, in the ballad the officiant is a woman. This has no

[5] *Prolegomena to the Study of Greek Religion*, p. 491.

[6] Clement's list (*Cohort.*, p. 5) is given in two lines which he quotes from 'the Thracian Orpheus':

> *κῶνος καὶ ῥόμβος και παίγνια καμπεσίγυια*
> *Μῆλα τε χρύσεα καλὰ παρ' 'Εσπερίδων λιγυφώνων.*

That of Arnobius (*Adv. Nationes*, v, 19), likewise credited to Orpheus ('prodidit in carminibus Thracius'), runs: 'talos, speculum, turbines, volubiles rotulas, et teretis pilas [cf. 'to toss their ball around' in the ballad] et virginibus aurea sumpta ab Hesperidibus mala.' Both passages ar given in Abel, *Orphica*, p. 230.

[7] In versions G, K, S, U in Child the series is apple, ring, cherry red as blood; in J it is apple, fig; in L it is apple, sugar; in M it is apple, fig, cherry red as blood; in the Missouri version it is apple, ring, something so cherry red. All these ar versions recorded in the nineteenth century or later. Versions A (Jamieson), B (Percy), C (Percy papers), D (Herd), E (Motherwell), F (recent Irish), and N (Newell, *Games and Songs of American Children*) do not show a series. But this constitutes no more than a very faint presumption that the versions without the series ar the older.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

parellel either in Jewish or in Christian ritual.[8] It may, of course, be nothing but an evidence of the romantic temper of balladry. But one remembers that the ritual attendants of Dionysus ar women.[9] Even Our Lady's draw-well[10] and the miraculus retention of life in the murderd boy ar cald to mind by Athene and her cista in the myth.

The ways of tradition ar often like those of Providence, past finding out. Whether a given story or practis found at different times and places shal be explained by the assumption of communication from a common source or on the theory of separate spontaneous origin under corresponding conditions is and perhaps always must be, in many cases, matter of opinion. In the present case it seems to me that there is at least the possibility of the transmission of these imaginings thru ecclesiastical tradition,[11] from the time when Christianity was working itself free from the welter of religions in the later empire. I can even imagin some ballad-loving friar of the fourteenth or fifteenth century, who coud sing like Huberd

[8] Nor does it appear in any of the erly cronicle or other records as reported by Child in his preface to this ballad. The boy is simply 'stolen' or 'kidnapped.' In the French versified miracle of Gautier de Coincy the boy is indeed entised into a Jew's house 'by flattery and promises,' but the entiser is a man, not a woman. The malign figure of the Jew's dauter seems to belong only to the ballad form of the story.

[9] Not to be sure in the myth as here given; but remember the deth of Orpheus.

[10] In versions A, B, C, E, F, N.

[11] The charge appears to hav been nowhere formulated until the Crusades had brought western Christendom into contact with the East and the Greek church. And it was formulated by churchmen. Lea says (*l. c.*, p. 234) that in one case in Germany in the fourteenth century it was 'proved that an ecclesiastic had arranged the affair in order to excite enmity against the Jews.' A century erlier, despite the more humane and liberal attitude reveald in Innocent IV's two bulls of 1247, it was an ecclesiastic, Sir John of Lexington, who took charge of the case of Hugh of Lincoln in 1255. He was, Matthew Paris tels us (*Hist. Maj.*, anno 1255), 'vir quidem circumspectus et discretus, *insuper eleganter literatus.* Qui ait: Audivimus quandoque quod talia Judaei in opprobrium Jesu Christi domini nostri crucifixi non sunt veriti attemptare.' Having got into the swet-box the luckless Jew into whose house the boy is alleged to hav disappeard, he proceeds to prompt his confession—'animavit eum et stimulavit ad hoc domini Johannis industria.' And the confession begins: 'Vera sunt *quae dicunt Christiani*. . .'

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

and at the same time had some acquaintanse, whether at first hand or fourth makes little differense, with the gruesome imaginings recorded by Felix and Clement and Arnobius, setting afloat the ballad that has come down to us. But I hav no expectation of finding his performanse 'writ in ancient history'—any more than of finding Rinordine's castle there.

H. M. Belden.

University of Missouri.

REVIEWS

Du Nouveau sur la Chanson de Roland. By P. Boissonnade. Paris: Champion, 1923. Pp. vi + 520.

This work by the Dean of the Faculty of Letters of the University of Poitiers is of considerable interest to Romance scholars; it has grown out of historical studies of the expansion of French mediæval civilization and has been immediately inspired by Bédier's *Légendes Epiques.* It is written from the standpoint of the historian and the object is to discover the precise epoch to which the *Roland* owes its inspiration, to study its historical and geographical setting, to determine the date of publication and to shed new light on the author's personality. Bédier's general theory of the late origin of the French epic is upheld. M. Boissonnade limits himself to the *Roland*; his new conclusions are based chiefly upon the historical and geographical arguments. On this side it is the most exhaustive study of the *Roland* yet published; the author takes up the problems left unsolved by Bédier and goes beyond him in his conclusions.

The French crusades in Spain (especially from 1064 to 1148) are discussed; they were directed principally to the Ebro Basin and were of far more importance than has been supposed. They were the result of an outburst of chivalric, patriotic and religious enthusiasm, and were comparable in the eleventh century mind to the later crusades in the Orient. This portion of the work is new and of great bearing on the *Roland*; it is based on a laborious examination of Arabic, Spanish and French documents. However it is regrettable that M. Boissonnade has published only his con-

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

clusions; until the publication of his promised documentary evidence final judgment must be reserved.

The military activities of the Christian and Mussulman leaders and the resultant feudal colonization with participants from all parts of France are described in detail. The author concludes that the principal historical elements of the *Roland* are derived from these French crusades in the Ebro Valley. A detailed study of the half hundred Spanish geographical terms in the *Roland* is given, in accordance with Gaston Paris' principle of limiting the search to the scene of the action of the poem. If history and geography are against acceptance, there cannot be an identification on philological grounds alone. The poet's ideas of Spain as a whole are vague; Santiago, Toledo, etc., are mentioned in a cursory way. He is familiar only with the territory of the Upper Ebro, corresponding to the State of Saragossa, and this is also the scene of the French crusades up to 1120. Saragossa is the most important city in the poem, just as its conquest was the most important of the crusades; next is Tudela, the military key to the route from Roncevaux to Saragossa and an important conquest and centre for French colonists. The remaining places are to-day unimportant, but a number were of marked influence during the crusades. An interesting example of the identifications is that of *Haltilie* in the troublesome line *Les chefs en prist es puis desuz Haltilie* (l. 209); alluding to the exposure by King Marsile of the heads of Charlemagne's envoys. M. Boissonnade finds in the Latin life of Raimond (French Bishop of Barbastro, 1104-26) a reference to a neighboring hill surmounted by a gibbet, a sort of Spanish Montfaucon; near are the villages of Peraltilla and Secastilla. *Haltilie* then results from aphaeresis; by granting a scribal error *Peraltilie* (*Secastilie*) may be restored with omission of *-suz*. The ten fiefs of Marsile's peers are found to be arranged symmetrically around Saragossa as a centre. Fairly good reasons are given for identifying *Sibilie* not with Seville but with a fortress Sevil near Barbastro. Against all other scholars *Turteluse* is identified with Tortoles (near Tudela), not with the distant and larger Tortosa. The identifications may be divided into certain, probable, and possible. M. Boissonnade grants that some are no more than possible, but his general argument that the poet refers to the upper Ebro Valley seems sound. His method suggests a twofold attack with history

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

and geography as his shock troops and philology supporting his flanks when not held in reserve or neglected entirely (the author is evidently not a philologist). Among the conquests of Roland the elusive *Noples* is identified as Napal, near Barbastro. Less convincing is the identification of *Comibles* (Oxford Ms.: *Commibles*) with Monubles; the philological difficulties are rather lightly dismissed by suggesting a change of *m* to *c*, *m* to *n* and *u* to *i* through scribal errors. Nor is the identification of Charlemagne's conquest of *Cordres* with the little village of Cortes near Tudela convincing; the usual identification of *Corduba* > *Cordóba* > *Cordres* (*sic* M. Boissonnade, but Spaniards say *Córdoba!*) offers difficulties, but so does *Cortes* > *Cordres.* The great booty of Cordres is not applicable to the small Cortes; M. Boissonnade would explain it by confusion with some unknown conquest. The situation of Cortes is favorable, but the identification will doubtless be questioned. The identification of the supreme battle between Charlemagne and Marsile with the capture of Saragossa in 1118 is striking.

The study of the itineraries of Northern Spain shows that the poet was too familiar with the routes between Saragossa and Roncevaux, between the Upper Ebro and the Pyrenees, to have acquired his information otherwise than by actual residence; five-sixths of the geographical terms are found in this district. The exact information could hardly have been acquired from returning pilgrims; here M. Boissonnade goes beyond Bédier.

The next step is obvious. Most of these places were of importance only through their association with the French crusades, only a poet who had been in this region at that time could have produced the *Roland.* Such conquests of the poem as Balaguer, Tudela, Saragossa, and many others, can be based only on the historical conquests of these places in the first twenty years of the twelfth century. The *Roland* is therefore inspired by the French crusades and does not descend from the preceding centuries, a theory that agrees with, but at the same time extends, the theory of Bédier.

In the study of the secondary inspiration of the *Roland,* that is, the contacts of Christians and Mussulmans in Africa and Asia, a detailed and most interesting description of the mediæval Mussulman civilization is given. This study is based in large part on Arabic sources. An interesting example among about eight Afri-

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

can names of the poem is the identification of the troublesome *Califerne* with *Kalaa* (stronghold) and *Ifrene* (a Berber tribe); *cf.* Spanish Calatayud. (M. Boissonnade here shows his usual weakness in linguistics by not citing convincing parallels.) There were a number of such strongholds near Tlemcen, but the greatest was near the modern Setif and was the capital of a great Mohammedan state. Califerne became in the later Portuguese romances the name of the imaginary country of the black Amazons, and is now that of the state of California. The poet's descriptions of the African Mohammedans correspond to the conditions of the eleventh and twelfth centuries. In the identification of the half score of deformed names of pagans from Northern Europe little is given beyond the indication of possibilities. In regard to the Oriental crusades the poet shows that he knew of them, but his information is of the general sort that could be obtained orally or from the Latin histories of the early twelfth century. M. Boissonnade acknowledges that of the fifty Oriental names some of the identifications are doubtful, but the names agree too closely with the Asiatic places, peoples, and events connected with the crusades for the poet either to have invented them or to have written before the twelfth century. The mention of these names furnishes further proof of the contention that the *Roland,* while inspired directly by the Spanish crusade, rises to a greater height and portrays the general struggle between the Christian West and the Moslem East. Thus it has the central idea of the universal crusade, it has the unity of action of a classic tragedy, and must be the work of one poet who could not have written it before the twelfth century.

Next comes a most interesting study of the poem as a reflection of mediæval civilization at the time of the crusades. M. Boissonnade's originality consists in pointing out the great influence of the Spanish crusade in this connection. To the old chronicle of Einhard the *Roland* owes only two names and one fact; the poem reflects the twelfth century. The poet has shifted the story of the crusade to this earlier period; into this mould, cold from its age of three hundred years, he has poured the glowing theme of the crusades. Much new material is given on the political, feudal, military, naval, economic and social organization of the Mussulmans; then follows a similar study of the West, especially

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

of France, with particular emphasis on the chivalric and patriotic ideas, the Church Militant, the unity of the French nation and the Christian world against the Mussulmans, to show that the *Roland* bears the indelible mark of the epoch of the crusades.

In his study of the older elements in the *Roland* M. Boissonnade follows Bédier in attributing a certain influence to monastic legends (chiefly of Charlemagne), but emphasizes more than Bédier the influence of contemporary civilization; the poet has taken the mummies of monastic chronicles and revivified them with the inspiring breath of the crusades. The legend of Charlemagne, originating in the sanctuaries, is a creation due to the mystic faith and the chivalric exaltation which created the crusades, blended with the Capetian conception of the king as the Lord's anointed; he is the head of Gregory VII's ideal theocracy, not the independent emperor of 800; he is a synthesis of the great leaders of the crusades. So too Roland is to a certain extent a creation of monastic tradition, but striking analogies are given to show that he is also a synthesis of crusade leaders, particularly of Gaston de Béarn and Rotrou de Perche. The two other characters resulting from a fusion of monastic legend and history are Turpin and Ganelon. Naimes, Olivier, Pinabel and Gautier de l'Hum (the etymology of Hum is questionable and some of the analogies are weak) are not legendary, but drawn from contemporary history and embellished by the poet. The secondary characters of Ogier, Anseïs, and Girart de Roussillon owe their fame to monastic legend, but M. Boissonnade sees in them also the influence of contemporary figures (in Ogier the Count of Flanders, known as Charles de Danemark, son of King Canute IV of Denmark, etc.). The poet's attention was probably directed to these legendary figures by similarity in names and achievements of eleventh and twelfth century historical characters; this argument is supported by numerous identifications and analogies, many individually unimportant, but of weight in their mass. The remaining secondary characters (about 40) owe nothing to legend, but are created by the poet from his contemporaries, particularly from the participants in the Spanish crusade. They are distributed by the poet throughout the various provinces with the Duché de France and his native Normandy as his favorites. Roland's fiancée, Aude, and Queen Bramimonde, baptized Juliane, the only women of the epic, may have been sug-

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

gested by two Norman ladies, Ada de Roucy, aunt of the crusade leader Rotrou de Perche, and Juliane, sister of the same leader; the probably close connection between the poet and these families supports this suggestion. In the two Norman names (Grandonie and Turgis) given by the poet to Saracens M. Boissonnade sees a touch of satire and the reflections of passions of the times. The poet has thus singled out a few great characters on which he concentrates the attention, they are a fusion of legend and contemporary history; then he has grouped around them a number of secondary characters almost wholly taken from the contemporary period of the crusades, his object being to celebrate the Christian heroes in their struggle against the Infidel. The *Roland* is therefore a combination of poetic legend and realism, inspired by and portraying the age of the crusades.

The generally accepted, but vague date (1100-1120) may then be incorrect. The poem was probably written after 1120, possibly before 1124, almost certainly before 1130-1131. Reasons for *terminus a quo:* references to Oriental and Spanish crusades in Transjordania and Edessa, 1120), Tudela and Tortoles (1120), Saragossa (1118), etc.; for *terminus ad quem:* references to the *Roland* by Vital (soon after 1124), Malmesbury (1125-1140), Raoul de Caen (soon after 1131), inscription of Nepi (1130-1131). While the narrow dating (1120-1124) is not proved, M. Boissonnade has established a presumption in favor of the third decade as the date of composition.

What deductions may be made regarding the poet's personality? M. Boissonnade agrees with Tavernier that a knowledge of the Bible and of the Church ritual shows that the poet was the product of ecclesiastical culture, probably a cleric, but not a monk. The importance of the revival of learning in the period following the middle of the eleventh century is only beginning to be understood; he is a product of this epoch; his knowledge of classical antiquity, while not profound, shows a certain education. The poet was then an educated cleric of deep faith who wrote under the influence of the crusade. Faral and Foulet have brought out the distinction between the clerical *ménestrels* favored by the church for their edifying poems and the excommunicated *jongleurs* or *histrions.* The poet would belong to the first of these classes. Therefore, though M. Boissonnade does not translate the trouble-

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

some final line, *Ci falt la geste que Turoldus declinet,* he would apparently interpret it as Here ends the poem composed and sung by the author-minstrel Turold. Discussion of this line has not ceased (*cf.* R. T. Holbrook, *M.P.*, XXI (1923), 155-164). References to prominent contemporary families establish the probability that this minstrel-poet frequented the courts (Anjou, Laon, Troyes, etc.) ; he had almost certainly been in Spain during the crusades; he was closely connected with the noble family of Rotrou de Perche (*cf.* characteristics of Roland, Aude, Juliane, etc.), and he was a Norman from the Avranchin for the following reasons in addition to the dialectic peculiarities (which are left by M. Boissonnade to the philologists): Norman war-cries, glorification of Norman achievements in England, Italy, etc., predilection for Normans in his historical characters (Roland, Oliver, Gautier de l'Hum, Aude, Juliane, Grandonie, Turgis, etc.), first mention of the poem by Normans (Vital, Malmesbury, Raoul de Caen), oldest manuscript by an Anglo-Norman scribe, mention of the cult and festival of St. Michel, choice of date of this festival for Charlemagne's festival at Aix, St. Michel coming to receive Roland's soul, Gautier de l'Hum (fief near Mont-Saint-Michel) as the faithful vassal of Roland. In addition M. Boissonnade has discovered in a chart of Our Lady of Tudela that a Norman cleric Willelmus Turoldus (no explanation of this peculiar combination is given) was there in 1128, that he was a friend of Roger de Sai, who was apparently a member of the noble Norman family of Sai holding fiefs near Mont-Saint-Michel in the Avranchin. M. Boissonnade believes that Guillaume Turold, the Norman cleric living in Tudela, which was the fief of Rotrou de Perche, and a friend of Roger de Sai, is the presumptive author of the *Roland*; but M. Boissonnade admits that this is only an hypothesis.

Finally, while many individual conclusions in the work do not go beyond possibilities or probabilities and will be disputed, in their mass they are of weight. M. Boissonnade has established by historical parallels a presumption that the *Roland* is a production of the third decade of the twelfth century and that it was written under the influence of the Spanish crusade. Therefore he supports Bédier, but in his conception of the influence of the crusades he has widened Bédier's theory. Unfortunately his linguistic arguments are usually too weak to be of weight.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

There are a number of misprints in the volume, mostly of a minor nature, though it is startling to see a reference to the ninth volume of the *Légendes Epiques* (p. 351) and to page 1190 when the work mentioned contains only 477 pages, (p. 455). The bibliography is very large (22 closely printed pages); it is not always up to date, *e. g.* the old edition of Voretzsch (*Einführung*), published in 1905, is cited instead of the revised edition of 1913. If the reader looks in vain for the editions by Kölbing, Foerster, etc., it should be remembered that M. Boissonnade has limited his discussion to the version of the Oxford manuscript. The lack of maps is felt and in view of the immense number of proper names in this work of 200,000 words the omission of an index is also regrettable; even more so is the lack of the original documents used as sources. Before their publication no final judgment can be passed on the book.

DOUGLAS L. BUFFUM.

Princeton University.

Le Livre de la déablerie. By Eloy D'Amerval. Edited by C. F. Ward. University of Iowa Humanistic Studies, II, 2. Iowa City, 1923. Pp. xxiii, 505.

Despite its title, this intensely moral book "traicte de plusieurs . . . profitables matieres touchant la maniere de vivre en chascun estat" (p. 12 L), well deserved a modern edition. None has hitherto appeared, and the early prints, of which that by Michel Le Noir, Paris, 1508, is probably the first—its privilege dates from January, 1507 (1508 N. S.)—have all become exceedingly rare.

The poem, cast in the form of a dialogue between Satan and Lucifer, with minor interruptions by the author, belongs to the didactic literature of the time; it discusses various theological questions and catalogues with suitable reprimands an exhaustive list of contemporary sinners, but it hardly ranks either in matter or form with the works of Coquillart or Gringore. Its value consists chiefly in the material it provides for the study of these and other writings of the period and in its relation to such dramatic forms as the *débat* and the morality play, rather than in its originality or the influence it exerted. To laud the "surprisingly modern" qualities of this very mediæval poem (pp. vii, xxii), to

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

compare it with the *Faust* of Marlowe or of Goethe (p. xix), and to use the word "masterpiece" in connection with it (p. xxiii) seems to me to obscure instead of to reveal its real interest and importance.

Unfortunately the present edition leaves much to be desired. The Introduction is slight and uncritical, and the text which follows has been so presented as to limit its usefulness for most purposes. Since the type of the Le Noir print—which forms the basis of the book—is not reproduced, it is difficult to understand why the modern reader should have been plagued with a so-called "type of suitable character," a trying black-letter Gothic, anachronistically modernized by accents, apostrophes, hyphens and punctuation (in which the notes of interrogation and exclamation cannot be distinguished). The editor does not hesitate in his brief Introduction and notes to cite passages by folio (p. xx), by book and chapter (p. xxi), or by chapter alone (p. 249), but as the original foliation is nowhere indicated and as no index to the 261 chapters has been provided—a serious lack for all purposes of reference—the helpless reader is left to exhaust his patience in locating them. Should any be left him, it will be needed in searching for the emendations which are variously indicated by square brackets in the text, by footnotes, and, "so that all departures from the original may be strictly accounted for," by inclusion in an Appendix of "obvious errors" (p. 253 ff.). There are also ten "suggested emendations" on p. 259, and a few others are scattered through the Index Nominum et Rerum. Certain "obvious errors" (*e. g.* the numbering of chapters one and two on p. 3 R) have escaped even these widely distributed depositories. The inconvenience involved in using the text is further increased by the awkward system of pagination adopted and by the fact that the lines are not numbered.[1]

The high-sounding Index Nominum et Rerum (of four pages) is neither an index of names nor a vocabulary, and the basis upon which selection for it has been made is not apparent. For example, some of the epithets applied to Satan and Lucifer appear there,

[1] Perhaps they account for the large proportion of wrong references in these few pages: p. xxi, Book II, ch. 107 (read 139); p. 249 s. v. Baueux, p. 21 R (read 28 R); s. v. Broquart, broquardeux, ch. 41 (read ?); p. 250 s. v. Emplumé, l. 7 (read 8); p. 251 s. v. Longis, p. 178 L (read 178 R); p. 252 s. v. Vaudoises, p. 24 R (read ?).

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

but few are satisfactorily explained (*e. g. frapart, houlier, loudiere, narinart, quoquibus*) and many of equal interest or difficulty are not included (*bemus, mandegloire, tirelardon, filz de vielle lisse,* etc., etc.).[2] The comments after *Basin d'Orlyens, Debibeufz, Foramen,* and *Mengine* are useless, merely repeating the text. Interrogation points occur after such clearly correct equivalents as *conards* = *cornards, Longis* = *Longinus, lequelt* = *lequel. Haro* (why included?) is defined as a "Norman exclamation of angry surprise." The explanation for *Destobent,* p. 8 R, l. 5 is of course not "= *destorbent?*"; a reference to p. 199 L, l. 39 would have shown that it is a misprint for *desrobent.* One prefers Godefroy's interpretation of *Glic* to the inadequate and un-English "a gambling game practised among students." Many instances of *Trout avant* may also be found in Godefroy; why should the reader be referred without further explanation to Helinand's *Vers de la Mort?*

In short, we have in this book an interesting text upon which considerable effort has evidently been expended, but which has been so inadequately edited as to be of little service to the modern reader, whether his curiosity be literary or philological.

GRACE FRANK.

Baltimore.

Das Grabbe-Buch. Herausgegeben in Verbindung mit zahlreichen Forschern und Dichtern von Paul Friedrich und Fritz Ebers. Detmold: Meyersche Hofbuchhandlung (Max Staercke), 1923. 170 pp.

Grabbe is one of several German writers who, depreciated and decried by most literary historians for many years, has at a late date come more or less into his own. While it cannot in any sense be claimed that Grabbe is now enjoying a vogue, it is true that especially since the war he has found many readers, not a few defenders and some enthusiasts, who believe either that his message as a poet is particularly apposite at the present time or that his works conceal high qualities that have as yet remained unrecog-

[2] A list of the interesting names and words omitted would exceed the limits of a review but it would be well worth making. Godefroy who knew and used the text by no means solved all its difficulties.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

nized. Among the most ardent adherents of Grabbe may be named the expressionists. In his *Bücher-Dekameron* (1923) Edschmid, one of the spokesmen of this school, clearly expresses his strong admiration for Grabbe, whom he deems an outstanding figure in German literature. "Zwischen Grabbe und Wedekind liegt der deutsche Stil und nicht zwischen Iphigenie und Ibsen," says Edschmid (p. 78). And again (p. 44): "Deutsch ist nicht das unvollkommen gestaltete Klare, sondern das im Dunkel ringend Gebaute. Deutsch ist nicht der magyarische Melancholiker Lenau aber etwas an Grabbe." Prompted by such sentiments, it seems, the two editors Paul Friedrich and Fritz Ebers, both men of letters, have published *Das Grabbe-Buch,* a collection of miscellanea of uneven merit intended to serve as a literary monument to its hero.

The introduction by Friedrich, an overenthusiastic, uncritical panegyric of Grabbe, with the expressionist's stock attack against the German classics to the effect that they are cold, lifeless, outworn and un-German, is followed by Freiligrath's lines *Bei Grabbe's Tod,* some verses by Carl Mahnke and several paragraphs, *Grabbe-Mal,* again by Friedrich, in which Grabbe's dual nature as a realist and dreamer is brought out. The next article is from the pen of Fritz Chlodwig Lange, who writes on *Grabbe und wir,* sketching Grabbe's influence from the time of his death to the present and his significance in the history of German dramatic style. *Grabbe als politischer Dichter* is treated by Paul Leutwein, who considers *Heinrich der Sechste* the poet's best play and his dramatic work in general strong and sound, comparing him favorably in his political insight and delineation of characters with Shakespeare. The two sketches *Grabbe und Schopenhauer* and *Grabbe und Nietzsche* by Otto Nieten and Hermann Jockisch, respectively, uncover no actual influences, merely parallelisms.

The article on *Marius und Sulla* by Friedrich is a plea for a better appreciation of Grabbe's Roman drama. Friedrich's opinion of Grabbe's character of Sulla is apparently much higher than that held by Leutwein in a preceding article. Short sketches on *Grabbe und Müllner* and *Grabbe und Immermann,* the latter by Nieten, present nothing essentially new. The topic *Grabbe und Hebbel* is covered by a section from Arthur Kutscher's book by that title (1913). *Musik und Musiker in Grabbe's Leben,* by Georg Richard Kruse, shows by excerpts from Grabbe's writings that his innate love for music was not supported by any very keen critical insight

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

as regards musical subjects. Grabbe's relations to the composers Lortzing and Norbert Burgmüller—it was for the latter that he wrote his parody *Der Cid*—are also traversed in this paper.

An interesting subject is touched upon in Alfred Bergmann's *Grabbe als Gestalt des Dramas,* wherein six dramas are discussed in which the character of Grabbe plays a rôle. By far the most important of these is Hanns Johst's comparatively recent *Der Einsame* (1917). A related topic, *Grabbe im Spiegel späterer Dichtung,* merely offers passages from various imaginative products inspired by Grabbe's life and works, such as Paul Friedrich's novel on Grabbe.

Fritz Ebers discusses the question *Wie sah Grabbe aus?* He comes to the conclusion that all the extant likenesses of the poet are unsatisfactory, the best being the portrait by Ludwig Heine. Ebers' quotations from the writings of friends of Grabbe describing his appearance are of value. In giving the names of two modern artists who have exercised their skill in depicting Grabbe, Ebers is guilty of inaccuracies. They are the sculptor Walter Scheuffer (not Scheufen, p. 158) and the artist Eduard Schulz (not Paul Schulz, p. 159). Of the various authentic sketches of Grabbe made during his lifetime the editors unfortunately reproduce only that by Theodor Hildebrandt, which Ebers calls poor.

So far as new or comparatively new material is concerned, the book contains two items. One is the fragmentary one-page scenario of *Eulenspiegel,* discovered by Ebers in 1916 in Grabbe's copy of the Eulenspiegel chapbook, which he unearthed in a second-hand book shop in Liegnitz. The introductory paragraph of this scenario is significant for Grabbe's conception of the theme: "Vorzumerken: Eulenspiegel ist nicht ein blosser Spassmacher, sondern er repräsentiert die aus dem tiefsten Ernst entstandene deutsche Weltironie." The other new item is in the form of two rather trivial snatches of album verse written by Grabbe in 1817, before he had reached his sixteenth birthday, one on wine, the other on the futility of life. The subjects and treatment are rather characteristic of Grabbe.

The greatest value of the *Grabbe-Buch* probably lies in its last ten pages. They present first a useful list, compiled by Alfred Bergmann, of all recorded performances of Grabbe's plays, the city and theatre in which each took place, as well as the date. (According to Bergmann there has been a total of 85 presentations of

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

Grabbe, of which only 25, or less than 30%, took place prior to 1900, and 49, or over 57%, since 1910. *Scherz, Satire, Ironie und tiefere Bedeutung* leads with 28 performances. Finally there is a Grabbe bibliography, also compiled by Bergmann. For the sake of greater completeness Bergmann's list may be supplemented by the titles listed by Bobertag on page 9 of volume 161 of DNL but omitted by Bergmann and by the volume *Deutsche Dramaturgie herausgegeben von Wilhelm von Scholz,* 3 vols., München, 1907-12 (selections from Kleist, Grillparzer, Immermann and Grabbe). Finally Bergmann might well have paid some attention to the numerous stage adaptations and revisions of Grabbe's plays—an interesting chapter in Grabbe bibliography. Considering only the seven major dramas that have been staged, the present reviewer knows of: 2 such adaptations of *Gothland,* 4 of *Scherz, Satire, Ironie und tiefere Bedeutung,* 8 of *Don Juan und Faust,* 4 of *Kaiser Friedrich Barbarossa,* 5 of *Kaiser Heinrich der Sechste,* 7 of *Napoleon* and 4 of *Hannibal.*

It is a general fault of the book that the articles are too short and sketchy. We might have expected more solid contributions from such men as Otto Nieten and Alfred Bergmann. On the whole, too, the editorial work has been poorly done. Thus the name of one of Grabbe's more recent editors, Wukadinovic, occurs in three different spellings, *viz.,* p. 48: Wukadinowi; p. 50: Wucadinovic; and p. 169: correctly, Wukadinovic. There are other minor inconsistencies. Yet if in spite of its shortcomings the *Grabbe-Buch* will help to win readers for Grabbe, it will have served a good purpose.

EDWIN H. ZEYDEL.

Indiana University.

The Novel of Democracy in America: a Contribution to the Study of the Progress of Democratic Ideas in the American Novel. By ALICE JOUVEAU DUBREUIL, Ph. D. Baltimore: The J. H. Furst Co., 1923. Pp. viii, 114.

This doctoral dissertation is the first part of a highly interesting and valuable study of an important group of American novels. The novel of democracy Miss DuBreuil defines as one " in which is expressed the spirit that has made possible our gradual

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

development toward religious freedom and political, economic, and social equality of opportunity." Many such novels are of course classified as historical novels; in fact, all of the forty-three which she discusses in chapters II-IV except *Modern Chivalry* and *The House of the Seven Gables.* The question will naturally rise: when is a historical novel not a novel of democracy? As examples of historical novels which do not fall within the category which she discusses here, Miss DuBreuil cites *The Spy* and *Hugh Wynne.* "Though in these works events are chronicled accurately and conditions are vividly portrayed, the spirit of protest and reform which animated those times is not sufficiently evident to characterize such works as novels of democracy." The fact that this name is found necessary for the group here discussed suggests that the ordinary connotation of the word *historical* is erroneous, since these novels which she includes under the name of novels of democracy—for example *Nicholas Minturn* and *The Honorable Peter Stirling*—are as true records of history as is the ordinary so-called historical novel.

The greater part of her first chapter Dr. DuBreuil devotes to a study of a group of forty representative novels of democracy. These she groups as satirical, social, political, economic, feminist, immigrant, and socialist. Charting these, she find that the greatest number of non-historical novels of democracy falls, as to the time of the story, within the decade 1905-15, and that the largest group is the economic. Probably too few novels are considered here to form a sufficient basis for generalization; but it is worth noting, as she points out, that this decade was "the so-called 'muck-raking' period of American politics, the era of political and economic reform-struggles."

In her discussion of the forty-three novels handled in chapters II-IV she has in general first stated the particular step or phase of religious, political, economic, or social growth which the given novel was chosen to illustrate here; secondly, she has indicated the theme of the story; thirdly, she has noticed particular characteristics or given a general estimate of the story.

In the succession of these stories there is set forth the gradual evolution of the power of the people from the time of the Divine Right of Kings, through class-oppression, religious persecution, and witchcraft, through communism and agrarianism, to popular government, made secure by the success of the Revolution. Then we

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

see, in the first reconstruction period, the reaction from the patriotism of the Revolution and a satirical attitude toward the first crude attempts at self-government; the second war with Great Britain; the new era of democracy in the West under the leadership of Jackson which broke the power of the legislative aristocracy, grown strong since the achievement of independence; how the enjoyment of liberty made American writers sensitive to oppression in other countries; how an awakened conscience revealed the injustice done the Indian and set in motion the laws of compensation; how the people began to realize the inadequacy of political freedom without economic equality and reform legislation; how the gold fever brought to the Western coast battles for law and order from which the colonists had been free; the conditions of slavery, the battle for States' rights, the approach of the Civil War. The whole is a revelation of what the novel can do if allowed to speak, in the way of making clear the conditions under which America has become what she is to-day. Perhaps no better way could be devised of getting at the true history of the American people than to go systematically through the hundred novels of democracy here listed in an appendix.

CLARK S. NORTHUP.

Cornell University.

Herzog Naimes im altfranzösischen Epos. By GERHARD MOLDENHAUER. Halle (Saale): Max Niemeyer, 1922. Romanistische Arbeiten herausgegeben von Karl Voretzsch, no. IX, xii + 180 pp.

As early as 1865, in his *Histoire poétique de Charlemagne,* Gaston Paris told of the need of special studies dealing with the principal heroes of the Carolingian cycle; since then, however, comparatively few such studies have been made. Thus the present work is a welcome one, and we are grateful to Dr. Moldenhauer for this *histoire poëtique* of Naime, duc de Bavière, Charlemagne's *maistre conseillier,* the Nestor of the Old French *chansons de geste.* The author's choice of this likable hero is particularly fortunate. Naime embodies ideals that are universally admired: loyalty, uprightness, and wisdom. Naime, gifted with Cornelian grandeur, is, indeed, the type of the counsellor "*comme il devrait être*" and well deserves to be the object of this exhaustive monograph.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

M. shows that Naime in no way appears as a stereotyped character; on the contrary, his characteristics undergo a gradual development. Originally Naime bears no title connected with Bavaria, he is not necessarily an old man "*a la barbe florie*" and the counsellor *par excellence,* but merely a counsellor *inter alios.* Occasionally he acts the part of a peer, as in the *Voyage de Charlemagne, Renaut de Montauban, Fierabras, Huon de Bordeaux.* It is only in the course of a century that these various attributes gradually become a part of his character. The basic characteristics of Naime are first given in the *Chanson de Roland.* In the *Aspremont, Aquin,* and Bodel's *Chanson des Saisnes,* Naime has reached his zenith not only as an unexcelled adviser, but also as a keen politician and undaunted knight and leader. Naime enjoys the greatest popularity when the *chansons de geste* were most in vogue; from that time on, however, there is a perceptible decline in his moral character; in *Renaut de Montauban* his faithfulness as a vassal has its limitations, and his wisdom borders on ruse; in *Huon de Bordeaux,* which added greatly to his prestige, he does not spare his emperor when the latter favors traitors or is tricked by them. In the *Voyage de Charlemagne* and *Fierabras* his lofty ideals degenerate into comic and grotesque effects. In the cycle of Guillaume, Naime assumes a secondary place; in Aimeri's cycle his part is only incidental, while Adenet tells about his youth, and the Franco-Italian *gestes* still record his wisdom and loyalty. In later years Rustebeuf and Jean de Condé remember his virtues; during the Romantic movement Ludwig Uhland styles him a Bavarian hero, and Victor Hugo does not forget Naime's *rôle classique* in his *Aymerillot.*

In his explanation of Naime's title, duc de Bavière, M. dismisses as futile the attempts made to identify him with a Bavarian hero or with the Breton king, Nominoeius. At first Naime was not associated with the Dukedom of Bavaria, and the *Chanson de Roland,* the *Voyage de Charlemagne, Aquin, Huon de Bordeaux, Renaut de Montauban* (Parts II and III), and the *Couronnement de Louis* make no mention of it. Singularly enough, the *Historia Regum Francorum* names him *dux Wasconum.* Naime assumes the title of *duc de Bavière* for the first time in Conrad the Priest's *Ruolandes Liet,* shortly after 1131. This title occurs first in France twenty years later in the Pseudo-Turpin under the name of Naaman, dux Boioariae. Not until about 1200 did Naime ap-

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

pear to be generally known as *duc de Bavière* in the Old French epics. M. thinks that this linking of Naime's name with Bavaria must be Conrad's own invention. Conrad was then living at the court of Henry the Proud, at Ratisbon, and it was but natural for the German poet out of patriotic considerations to unite one of the heroes of the Carolingian cycle with the house of Bavaria: it added local coloring and promised success to his book. The introduction of this title into France was made possible through the medium of Latin—possibly through Conrad's own Latin translation of the *Chanson de Roland*—and of monasteries; this title would be another *légende des routes:* pilgrims and crusaders on their way East passed through Ratisbon, which offered to Germans and Frenchmen alike an opportunity for literary interchange. As an explanation for the wide-spread and rapid use of Naime's title in France, M. thinks that *"duc de Bavière"* and *"li Baiviers"* were favored by poets on account of their adaptability as assonances or rhymes and as syllables in the line, especially in the Alexandrine. Furthermore, the author remarks that Naime shows no quality specifically German or Bavarian. Thus we may consider *"li ber che li rois ama tant"* as a Romanized Frank, or rather, as Bédier aptly says of Old French epic heroes, as *un Franc de France.* The explanation given of Naime's title is suggestive and plausible, yet we are at a loss to account for Conrad's predilection for Naime. In this connection it would be of interest to know more definitely under what circumstances epic heroes were associated with the names of towns and countries, and if other heroes besides Naime bore this title. In the *Vie de Saint Honorat* we note that Pepin is named twice *duc de Bayviers.*[1]

The origin of the name, Naime, is also studied. The author finds that Naimes-Naimon is the form that occurs most frequently in Old French and is, in fact, the form regularly used in French and Norman MSS. The form Names-Namon stands by the side of Namles-Namlon; MSS. which show the latter form bear characteristics of the Picard and Picard-Wallonian dialects. As to the two etymological derivations — the Provençal *n'Aymo* < *Haimo, Hamo* and the Germanic *Namo*—offered for the name, Naime, the author seems to favor the Germanic origin as being more simple:

[1] Cf. G. Paris, *Histoire poétique de Charlemagne* (Paris, 1905), Appendice, pp. 496-497.

Digitized by Google
Original from
UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

Naimes < *Namo + e + s. The form Naimon is analogical, and Names is abridged from Namles < the Germ. diminutive *Namilo. There seems to be no hesitation between the forms Naimon and Namon in the oldest MSS., and in order to obviate this difficulty, the form Aimes-Aimon is proposed as a possible analogy. The origin of the name Naime has not yet been explained quite satisfactorily, and M. does well, for lack of evidence, to leave the question *en suspens*.

No exact model of the type of counsellor so powerfully represented by Naime in Old French epic is to be found in other literatures; M. believes that historical allusions and the treatment of the subject matter in the Old French epic sufficiently account for the formation of the type. The "*consiliarius*" is already found under the Merovingians, and at the court of the Carolingians and the Capetians there existed such attendants as "*consiliarii, palatini, familiares*" who performed diplomatic and military duties; furthermore, the famous Abbot Suger of Saint Denis, King Louis VI's "*fidelis familiaris*," could easily have served as the ideal figure for Naime. On the other hand, epic poets follow certain laws. In doubt and perplexity Charlemagne asks for advice, but Arthur and Guillaume do the same, and this appeal for help already appears in Ermoldus Nigellus. The law of contrast demands a counsellor or comforter by the side of an afflicted or helpless person; as epic technique excludes soliloquy, the results of reflection reacting against impulse are represented by the character of the counsellor; hence the creation of Naime who acts as Charlemagne's own conscience. Other parallels are cited from Germanic sagas and Greek and Latin literatures; Nestor stands as the nearest likeness to Naime, yet he differs in so far as Naime, chivalrous, justice-loving, and self-possessed as he appears, represents essentially abstract wisdom.

In the course of this study pertinent questions are raised concerning the relationship and priority of certain poems. As parts I and IV in *Renaut de Montauban* present Naime as *duc de Bavière* and parts II and III as *duc de France*, M. is of the opinion that chronologically parts II and III are older, since they point to a time when the title *duc de Bavière* was not yet generally known. In accord with Karl Voretzsch, the author believes in the priority of *Huon de Bordeaux* over *Renaut de Montauban;* with

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

equally good reasons he considers *Aspremont* to be an earlier poem than Bodel's *Chanson des Saisnes.*

In short, Dr. Moldenhauer has succeeded in giving us a scholarly and sympathetic portrayal of one of the most interesting heroes in the Old French *chansons de geste.* Studies of the same nature on other epic heroes are desirable and should be undertaken; their combined results would not fail to throw more light on the interrelationship of various epic poems.

HENRY E. HAXO.

University of North Dakota.

CORRESPONDENCE

AN OVERLOOKED SONNET

Edmund W. Gosse (*Ward's English Poets,* Vol. III, p. 7), introducing the poems of William Walsh, says, "It should be noted that Walsh is the author of the only sonnet [*Death*] written in English between Milton's in 1658 and Warton's about 1750."

Professor W. L. Phelps in *The Beginnings of the English Romantic Movement,* commenting on the odd disappearance of the sonnet during the "Augustan Age," has the statement (p. 44):

"The only sonnet written in English between the performances of Milton and Gray's sporadic attempt in 1742 *that has survived* [1] is the sonnet on Death, written curiously enough by Pope's mentor, William Walsh. . . ."

In a footnote, Professor Phelps comments as follows upon Mr. Gosse's statement, quoted above: "Mr. Gosse erroneously says that it is the only sonnet written in English between Milton's and Warton's."

A small octavo volume, published in 1735, has lately come to my notice. It is the property of Professor W. P. Trent. The title-page announces "The Christian Poet, or Divine Poems on the Four Last Things, viz, Death, Judgment, Heaven and Hell, written by the Reverend Mr. Pomfret, E. of Roscommon, Mr. Norris, Mr. Westley, Dan. De Foe, and others, to which is added, a Poem on the Resurrection by the late Joseph Addison, Esq; a Birthday Poem by Dean Swift, On Virtue &c. by Mr. Pope. On Eternity by Mr. Gay. With several other Divine Poems. London. Printed and sold by the Booksellers. (in)[2] Town and Country 1735."

[1] The italics are my own. G. F. E.
[2] The title-page is torn here.

On page 182 appears the following sonnet:

Death: A Sonnet

When Life's first Bloom affords untainted Joy,
And Youthful Spirits warm the bounding Heart,
Death shakes his Dart in vain, his Terrors fly
Before the Scoffer's Jest, or Reasoner's Art.
How chang'd the scene when raging Pains assail,
And fainting Nature feels her period near,
Nor Reason's Powers nor Fancy's Charms avail,
Mirth learns to sigh, Philosophy to fear.
Tho' Reason's Lamp, and Fancy's wandring fire
Amidst the Horrors of that Night expire,
Religion kindly lends a steadier Ray;
Her bright Effulgence dissipates the Gloom,
Expels the Terrors of the Yauning Tomb,
And Guides the Joyful Soul to Lasting Day.

Here, then, is a sonnet, apparently unnoted by Gosse or Phelps, which seems to be written "between Milton's sonnet in 1658 and Warton's about 1750." Oddly enough, it is upon the same subject as Walsh's sonnet. The certified Walsh Sonnet has as its rime-scheme: *ababbcbcddceec.* Our specimen has *ababcdcdeefggf.* It will be noticed that the riming plan of the octave is different in the two sonnets, while that of the sestet corresponds. That the latter sonnet is not by Walsh appears likely. It is not found among Walsh's works; moreover Walsh showed that he could write a fairly good sonnet on Death, while this is a poor one. Not only is the riming of lines 1 and 3 careless; the whole thought is stiff and forced.

The questions, of course, arise: who wrote this sonnet? Just when was it done? Is this the only book in which it appears? Much search has failed so far to answer these questions.

At least one value of our noting the piece lies in the fact that here is a sonnet which not only appears to contradict the too-easily formulated statement of Gosse, cited above, but certainly refutes even the more guarded one of Professor Phelps.

George Fullerton Evans.

University of Texas.

Bel Ami and Madame Walter

Mr. O. H. Moore (*P. M. L. A.*, 1918, xxxiii, 112) finds decidedly romantic inspiration for a well-known episode in *Bel Ami.* He would place Mme Walter's vain attempts in the church to conquer her passion for Duroy beside Julia's efforts to escape the fascination of Don Juan. He finds that Maupassant has been led "to reproduce several scenes in the poem which so greatly influenced the French Romanticists of the early 30's." Julia's prayers are "all in vain, for the moment Don Juan appeared

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

'That night the Virgin was no longer prayed."[1]

Mme Walter, seeking to avoid temptation, tries to pray, but sees only the curly moustache of Bel Ami."[2] And Mr. Moore concludes: "The boy whose irresistibly handsome features Julia caressed; the man whose cheek innocent Haidée was constrained to stroke; Antony, who fascinated Adèle with his eye; Bel Ami, who captured all women, from the courtesan at the Folies-Bergères to the wife of his employer—are of one and the same extraordinary *genus*. Whether examples of realism or Romanticism, they stand or fall together."

I have quoted Mr. Moore at some length because his argument is not sufficiently clear to permit me to give a summary. Now let us turn to the simple facts.

No one, I think, will deny that Bel Ami belongs to the race of men of prey—to the *genus Don Juan*, if Mr. Moore wishes—but that statement implies no necessary relation to Byron's poem. The lines quoted by Mr. Moore are a jesting allusion by the English poet to famous episodes in the legend. The immediate source of Maupassant's incident is, if anywhere, in *Madame Bovary*, in the scene between Emma and Léon in the cathedral at Rouen.[3] Flaubert sought merely a bit of dramatic realism: Maupassant adds a note of satire. Mme Walter is the wife of an unscrupulous Jewish financier; in her efforts to draw a veil over her husband's race, she becomes more Catholic than the pope and so offers a constant target for Maupassant's shafts. The scene itself is a literary commonplace. In *La Nuit de Mai* the Muse proposes to Musset various themes which are suggested by allusions to type. Here is one:

Peindrons-nous une vierge à la joue empourprée,
S'en allant à la messe, un page la suivant,
Et d'un regard distrait, à côté de sa mère,
Sur sa lèvre entr'ouverte oubliant sa prière?
Elle écoute en tremblant, dans l'écho du pilier,
Résonner l'éperon d'un hardi cavalier.[4]

As an example of a close parallel to Maupassant, I may cite Voltaire's *Zaïre*. The heroine is telling her confidant of her struggle between love and filial duty:

Fatime, j'offre à Dieu mes blessures cruelles,

. . . .

Je lui crie en pleurant: 'Ote-moi mon amour,

---

[1] *Don Juan*, Canto I, LXXVI.
[2] *Bel Ami*, ed. Conard, p. 405.
[3] *Madame Bovary*, ed. Charpentier, 1907, pp. 264 ff. (Beginning of Part III.)
[4] *La Nuit de Mai*, ll. 102 ff.

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

Arrache-moi mes voeux, remplis-moi de toi-même';
Mais, Fatime, à l'instant les traits de ce que j'aime,
Ces traits chers et charmants, que toujours je revoi,
Se montrent dans mon âme entre le ciel et moi.[5]

Mr. Moore's article is open to attack on at least two counts. His zest for source hunting inclines him to be satisfied with superficial resemblances and he forgets that the same theme may be handled romantically or realistically. It is the treatment and not the subject that may admit of labelling. If Mr. Moore were alone in his error I should not write this note.

Benjamin Mather Woodbridge.

Reed College.

A Note on Wordsworth and Vaughan

In connection with Mr. Merrill's article, *Vaughan's Influence upon Wordsworth's Poetry,* in *Mod. Lang. Notes* for February, 1922, the following suggestions of relationship between the two poets may be of interest:—

Vaughan, *Misery:* [1]

Lord, bind me up, and let me lie
A pris'ner to my liberty,
If such a state at all can be
As an impris'nment serving Thee;
The wind, though gather'd in Thy fist,
Yet doth it blow still where it list,
And yet shouldst Thou let go Thy hold
Those gusts might quarrel and grow bold.

Wordsworth, *Ode to Duty:* [2]

I, loving freedom, and untried;
No sport of every random gust,
Yet being to myself a guide,
Too blindly have reposed my trust:
And oft, when in my heart was heard
Thy timely mandate, I deferred
The task, in smoother walks to stray;
But thee I now would serve more strictly, if I may.

And in the light of truth thy Bondman let me live!

---

[5] *Zaïre,* Acte IV, sc. 1. Other examples will occur to every reader. Friends have suggested the following: (H. C. Lancaster) Racine, *Phèdre,* ll. 283 ff.; (G. Chinard) Goethe, *Faust,* Part I, ll. 3794 ff. and ll. 4461; (H. E. Woodbridge) Pope, *Eloïsa to Abelard;* (V. Chittick) H. A. Jones, *Michael and his Lost Angel;* G. Hauptmann, *The Heretic of Soana;* Hall Caine, *The Christian;* (S. G. Morley) Valera, *Pepita Jiménez.*—Cf. also, A. France, *Thaïs,* notably Part III, and the saints legends on which it is based; J. Delécluse, *Mlle Justine de Liron,* pp. 173-174 (Chefs-d'œuvres méconnus, 1923).

[1] Henry Vaughan: *Complete Poetical Works* (edited by E. K. Chambers).

[2] William Wordsworth: *Complete Poetical Works* (edited by A. J. George).

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

Vaughan, *The Constellation:*

Fair order'd lights—whose motion without noise
  Resembles those true joys
Whose spring is on that hill, where you do grow,
  And we here taste sometimes below,—
With what exact obedience do you move
  Now beneath, and now above.

. . . .

Settle, and fix our hearts, that we may move
  In order, peace, and love;
And taught obedience by Thy whole creation
  Become an humble, holy nation!

Wordsworth, *Ode to Duty:*

Thou dost preserve the stars from wrong;
And the most ancient heavens, through
Thee, are fresh and strong.
To humbler functions, awful Power!
I call thee: I myself commend
Unto thy guidance from this hour;
Oh, let my weakness have an end!

In a short poem called *Anguish,* Vaughan writes:

O! 'tis an easy thing
  To write and sing;
But to write true, unfeignèd verse
Is very hard! O God, disperse
These weights, and give my spirit leave
To act as well as to conceive!
  O my God, hear my cry;
    Or let me die!—

This last line is used by Wordsworth in his poem *The Rainbow:*

My heart leaps up when I behold
  A rainbow in the sky:
So was it when my life began;
So is it now I am a man;
So be it when I shall grow old,
  Or let me die!

It is of course possible that the use of this line is a coincidence; but may it not be that the music of this poem of Vaughan's lingered in Wordsworth's thoughts? There is a similarity of metre, the prevailing line in each poem being iambic tetrameter, and there being an occasional trimeter or dimeter line.

Muriel Morris.

Wellesley College.

A Source of Anatole France: Benvenuto Cellini

Considerable work has been done on the sources of Anatole France's *Rôtisserie de la Reine Pédauque.* The list of borrowings given by Michaut is imposing, but the resemblances are not always

Digitized by Google | Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

convincing.[1] The less contestable are those found in de Villar's *Comte de Gabalis,* Du Laurens' *Compère Matthieu* and Voltaire's *Candide.* On the other hand, there appear in the work other passages which seem derived from certain cabalistic sources, which still await discovery. One of these is quite obviously the story of the Salamander which runs through the whole volume. Nevertheless one incident of this story does not go back to any esoteric source, but was derived directly from the *Autobiography* of Benvenuto Cellini.

Benvenuto Cellini narrates the following incident from his childhood: "When I was about five years old, my father happened to be in a basement chamber of our house, where they had been washing, and where a good fire of oak logs was still burning. He had a viol in his hand and was playing and singing alone beside the fire. The weather was very cold. Happening to look into the fire, he spied in the middle of those most burning flames a little creature like a lizard, which was sporting in the core of the intensest coals. Becoming instantly aware of what the thing was, he had my sister and me called, and pointing it out to us children, gave me a great box on the ear, which caused me to howl and weep with all my might. Then he pacified me good humouredly and spoke as follows: 'My dear little boy, I am not striking you for any wrong that you have done, but only to make you remember that the creature which you see in the fire is a salamander, a creature which has never been seen before by anyone from whom we have credible information.' So saying he kissed me and gave me some pieces of money."[2]

Exactly in this way Ménétrier, the student of France's novel, thinks that he perceives a salamander in the fire and is given a blow by d'Asterac, who afterward assures him that he is only striking him so that he might forever remember the signal favor which was bestowed upon him by the appearance of the legendary animal:

"—Monsieur, poursuivit l'homme à la Salamandre, souffrez que votre jeune élève approche du foyer et dise s'il ne voit pas quelque ressemblance d'une femme au-dessus des flammes.

En ce moment, la fumée qui montait sous la hotte de la cheminée se recourbait avec une grâce particulière et formait des rondeurs qui pouvaient simuler des reins bien cambrés, à la condition qu'on y eût l'esprit extrêmement tendu. Je ne mentis donc pas tout à fait en disant que, peut-être, je voyais quelque chose.

[1] See Michaut, *Anatole France,* pp. 166-173, for a list based on J. E. Morel, *Grande Revue,* November, 1911; Leon Carias, *Grande Revue,* December, 1912 and January, 1913; G. Lanson, *L'Art de la Prose,* p. 281.
[2] *The Autobiography of Benvenuto Cellini,* tr. by J. Addington Symonds, p. 11.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

A peine avais-je fait cette réponse que l'inconnu, levant son bras démesuré, me frappa du poing l'épaule si rudement que je pensai en avoir la clavicule brisée.

—Mon enfant, me dit-il aussitôt, d'une voix très douce, en me regardant d'un air de bienveillance, j'ai dû faire sur vous cette forte impression, afin que vous n'oubliiez jamais que vous avez vu une Salamandre. C'est signe que vous êtes destiné à devenir un savant et, peut-être, un mage. Aussi bien votre figure me faisait-elle augurer favorablement de votre intelligence." [8]

Here again Anatole France shows his ability in arranging literary mosaics. The passage, undoubtedly inspired by Benvenuto Cellini, is incorporated very naturally in his text, and is in perfect accord with the development of the story.

T. Francis Tracy.

Minneapolis, Minnesota.

BRIEF MENTION

Guibert d'Andrenas. Edited by J. Melander. (Champion, 1922. 151 pp.) The same. Edited by Jessie Crosland. (Longmans, Green and Co., 1923. 95 pp.) In editing Old French texts it is now considered orthodox to follow M. Bédier's principles and print the text as it appears in a single manuscript, citing variants from the other manuscripts, but never—well, hardly ever—incorporating them in the text itself except to replace "fautes serviles, fausses lectures ou erreurs de la plume." There have been protestants of course—for an admirable statement of their case see Professor Jenkins' review in *Modern Philology*, xxi, 106 f.—but M. Bédier's dictum, borrowed from the archeologist Didron, that "il faut conserver le plus possible, réparer le moins possible, ne restaurer à aucun prix" has nevertheless been almost universally accepted.

It is not uninteresting therefore to come upon two recent editions of *Guibert d'Andrenas*, a hitherto unedited *chanson de geste* belonging to the *Aymeri de Narbonne* group, one (by Jessie Crosland) made in accordance with these principles and the other (by J. Melander) designed to drive the true Bédierite to desperation. M. Melander indeed because of his conviction that the original poem was in rhymed and not assonated *laisses* goes so far in "correcting" the manuscripts as to substitute analogical for etymological forms on the assumption that some of his scribes sacrificed rhyme to a correct sense of grammar—surely an original accusation to launch against a mediæval copyist. He naively remarks

[8] *La Rôtisserie de la Reine Pédauque*, pp. 49-50.

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

that it was easy to introduce the forms demanded by the rhyme: "nous n'avons eu qu'à suivre tantôt l'un tantôt l'autre des manuscrits." Could heresy be bolder?

And yet much of M. Melander's reasoning is convincing enough. Rhymed *laisses* preponderate, and with two exceptions the only infractions of rhyme consist in the presence or absence of the consonants *r* (after *e*) and *z* or *s* (after any vowel or *r*). If only the editor had contented himself with pointing out that etymological and analogical forms were beginning to be used interchangeably, that final *r* and *s* were tending to become silent, that accordingly most of the so-called assonances in the poem probably constituted satisfactory rhymes for the author, and had then given us his basic manuscript very much as the mediæval scribe left it, we could have no quarrel with him. As it is, however, his theories, not only about the versification of the poem, but also about the relative value of the readings in the different manuscripts are so engrafted upon the text itself that the reader is hampered at every turn, despite the notes, in reaching his own conclusions. Insertions of lines and words from other manuscripts, generally with altered spellings, and changes in the tenses of verbs in the interest of "regularity" present a fabricated and uncharacteristic "original" and an arbitrary uniformity that can hardly compensate for the loss of an authentic mediæval copy, however chaotic.

In this respect the edition of Miss Crosland is more satisfactory. She uses as a base the manuscript adopted by M. Melander, and though one may disagree with the alterations she finds it necessary to make and especially with her omission of lines held to be "clearly interpolations," the changes involved are relatively few and unimportant. Unfortunately, however, her introduction, notes and glossary are far from complete, and for any intensive study of the poem and its place in the cycle the Melander edition must be consulted. G. F.

Doctor Johnson, a Study in Eighteenth Century Humanism. By Percy H. Houston (Harvard University Press, 1923). Doctor Johnson has come down to us as a great critic and a great personality rather than as a striking creative artist in literature. The impression his amazing personality made upon his contemporaries has been transferred to succeeding generations through Boswell's *Life*, in this respect the greatest biography ever written. So successful has Boswell been that it has been said that Johnson was greater in Boswell's book than in his own, especially as readers in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries have found that the bulky volumes of his original work yield comparatively little of absorbing interest. Outside certain Lives of the Poets, a few essays and letters, there is little that as "mere literature" classes him with

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

the immortals. It is rather as a critic that Johnson can compete with the Johnson that Boswell paints. And how great a critic he was has been admirably shown by Professor Houston. Humanism he defines as the temper of mind derived from the Renaissance, conservative and skeptical, seeking standards of judgment out of the experience of the past, but not necessarily tory in its nature. On what solid foundation Johnson's humanism rested is made clear in a chapter devoted to his reading, which is accompanied in the Appendix by a catalogue of his books, and how sound and extensive was his scholarship is revealed in his familiarity with the leading classical and French critics from Aristotle to Boileau. His kinship with Aristotle and Horace among the ancients and Boileau among the French critics of the seventeenth century is made manifest in copious parallels of thought and phrase. Professor Houston brings out very clearly Johnson's relation to neo-classicism, showing wherein he fell a victim to his own prejudices and to the narrowness of his time and wherein he rose above his contemporaries and directed them to the broader vision of later criticism. He could not see the poetic loveliness of *Lycidas* nor the romantic rapture of Gray's *Odes,* and as a result he has been damned in popular estimation as a bigoted and hide-bound neo-classicist. But he gave a saner interpretation of Shakespeare than had existed hitherto, he freed dramatic criticism from the shackles of the unities and other sacred rules, and he waged war against all forms of conventional imitation, whether mythological or pastoral. He refused to judge a work by cataloguing its faults and beauties but appraised its worth by insisting upon the immediate reaction of the reader to the total impression the work made upon him. He held to the classical conception of the imagination as the "faculty that enabled one to perceive through all particular images and details the underlying principle to which they must be referred," and he hated the romanic predilection for the beautiful moment or the beautiful image as sufficient unto itself and regardless of any principle behind it. Related to this insistence upon form and content is his strong moral bias in matters critical, which arose from the "desire that a serious nature has to mediate between the matter of art and the matter of life" and which led him into a preference for Tate's version of *King Lear* with its happy ending, apparently because of his strong sympathy for Cordelia and his pious wish to see virtue triumphant. It led him also to condemn *Tom Jones* and approve of *Pamela,* a fact which shows that even the sturdiest good sense will sometimes succumb to sentimental morality. Professor Houston is eminently fair and like all persons who approach Doctor Johnson as disciples equally enthusiastic, and he writes in a style that is a joy to the reader who is not merely seeking material for a college lecture.

J. W. T.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

RECENT PUBLICATIONS

ENGLISH

Albert, Edw.—A History of English Literature. *New York:* Thomas Y. Crowell, 1924.

Asquith, H. H. — Studies and Sketches. *London:* Hutchinson, 1924.

Bell, Ralcy Husted. — The Mystery of Words. *New York:* Hinds, Hayden and Eldredge, 1924.

Boas, F. S. (editor).—Essays by Divers Hands. [From the Transactions of the Royal Society of Literature, new series, Vol. III.] *London:* Oxford University Press, 1923.

Boas, R. P. and Hahn, B. M.—Social Backgrounds of English Literature. *Boston:* The Atlantic Monthly Press, 1923.

Campbell, Olwen Ward.—Shelley and the Unromantics. *London:* Methuen, 1924.

Dakers, Andrew. — Robert Burns. *New York:* E. P. Dutton and Co., 1923. $3.50.

De Mille, A. B.—American Poetry. *New York:* Allyn and Bacon, 1923. $1.00.

Elliott, G. R. and Foerster, N.—English Poetry of the Nineteenth Century. *New York:* The Macmillan Company, 1923. 8vo.

Faries, Randolph, 2nd.—Ancient Rome in the English Novel. A Study in English Historical Fiction. *Philadelphia:* Lyon and Armor, 1923.

Garnett, Richard and Gosse, Edmund.—English Literature: An Illustrated Record. With a Supplementary Chapter on the Literature from 1892 to 1923. *New York:* The Macmillan Co., 1923. $15.00.

Hamilton, Clayton.—On the Trail of Stevenson. *New York:* Doubleday, Page and Co., 1923. $2.00.

Harper, George McLean.—Poems by William Wordsworth. *New York:* Charles Scribner's Sons, 1923.

Huchon, René. — Histoire de la Langue Anglaise. Tome I, Des Origines à la Conquête normande. *Paris:* Librairie Armand Colin, 1923. 326 pp.

Johnson, Samuel. — Johnson's Proposals for his Edition of Shakespeare, 1756. Type-facsimile. *Oxford:* University Press, 1923. 3 pp. 3s. 6d.

Jonson, Ben.—"Discoveries," 1641; "Conversations With William Drummond of Hawthornden," 1619; reprinted from an old manuscript. *New York:* E. P. Dutton and Co., 1923. $1.50.

Masson, Rosaline.—The Life of Robert Louis Stevenson. *New York:* Frederick A. Stokes Company, 1923. 8vo. $3.00.

Mawer, Allen (and others).—The Problem of Grammar: The English Association Pamphlet, no. 56. *Oxford and New York:* Oxford University Press, 1923.

Morsbach, Lorenz. — Mittelenglische Originalurkunden von der Chaucer-Zeit bis zur Mitte des XV. Jahrhunderts. *Heidelberg:* Carl Winter, 1923. 59 pp.

Nicoll, Allardyce.—A History of Restoration Drama, 1660-1700. *Cambridge:* University Press, 1923. 397 pp. 16 sh.

Nicoll, Sir William Robertson.—Dickens's Own Story: Sidelights on his Life and Personality. *London:* Chapman and Hall, 1923. 10sh. 6d.

Palmer, Geo. Herbert. — A Catalogue of Early and Rare Editions of English Poetry. *Boston:* Houghton Mifflin Company, 1923. 8vo. $25.00.

Parrott, P. M.—The Problem of Timon of Athens. *London:* Humphrey Milford, 1923. 2s.

Poutsma, H.—The Infinitive, The Gerund, and The Participles of the English Verb. *Groningen:* P. Noordhoff, 1923. 240 pp. Fl. 4.50, geb. 5.50.

Quinn, Arthur Hobson.—A History of the American Drama from the Beginning to the Civil War. *New York:* Harper & Brothers, 1923. xv, 486 pp.

Rollins, Hyder E.—A Handful of Pleasant Delights (1584). By Clement Robinson and Divers Others. *Cambridge:* Harvard University Press, 1924.

Rollins, Hyder. — Cavalier and Puritan Ballads and Broadsides illustrating the Period of the Great Rebellion. 1640-1660. *New York:* New York University Press, 1924.

Sampson, George. — Much Ado About Nothing. *New York:* The Macmillan Co., 1923.

Scott, Dixon. — Men of Letters. *New York:* George H. Doran Co., 1923.

Sisam, Kenneth.—Chaucer: The Clerkes Tale of Oxenford. *New York:* Oxford University Press, American Branch, 1923. 95 cts.

Symons, Arthur. — Dramatis Personae. *Indianapolis:* Bobbs-Merrill Co., 1923. $2.50.

Veldkamp, Jan.—Samuel Butler, The Author of Hudibras. [Dissertation, University of Amsterdam.] *Hilversum:* Drukkerij "De Atlas," 1923.

Wallenberg, J. K. — The Vocabulary of Dan Michel's Ayenbite of Inwyt. A phonological, morphological, etymological, semasiological and textual study. *Uppsala:* Appelbergs Boktryckeri, 1923.

Williams, Iolo A.—The Shorter Poems of the Eighteenth Century. *London:* Heinemann, 1924. 10sh. 6d.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

GERMAN

Behaghel, Otto.—Deutsche Syntax. Eine geschichtliche Darstellung. Bd. II: Die Wortklassen und Wortformen. B. Adverbium. C. Verbum. [Germanische Bibliothek, I. Abt.: Elementar- und Handbücher, 10.] *Heidelberg:* Carl Winter, 1924. xii + 444 pp. $2.25.

Bergmann, Karl.—Deutsches Wörterbuch mit bes. Berücksichtigung d. Mundarten und Fremdwörter u. d. kulturgeschichtl. Inhalts d. Sprachschatzes alphabetisch u. nach Wortfamilien geordnet. Zugleich 3. Ausg. d. etymologischen deutschen Wörterbuches von P. I. Fuchs. *Leipzig:* Brandstetter, 1923. xx + 404 pp. M. 9.

Böss, Hugo.—Fischarts Bearbeitung lateinischer Quellen. 1. Fischarts Onomastica u. s. Quellen. 2. Fischarts Übers. von Wolfg. Lazius' De gentium migrationibus. [Prager deutsche Studien. H. 28]. *Reichenberg i. B.:* F. Kraus, 1923. 25 pp.

Draeger, Fritz.—Die Bindungs- u. Gliederungsverhältnisse der Strophen des Nibelungenliedes und ihre Bedeutung für Quellenkritik u. Altersfragen. [Germanische Studien, H. 28]. *Berlin:* Ebering, 1923. 72 pp.

Droste-Hülshoff, Annette v. — Dreiundzwanzig neue Droste-Briefe. Hrsg. v. Manfred Schneider. [Diotima-Druck. 3.] *Stuttgart:* W. Hädecke, 1923. 99 pp.

Fehrlin, Hans.—Die Paralipomena zu Immermanns "Münchhausen." [Sprache und Dichtung. H. 28.] *Bern:* Haupt, 1923. 124 pp. F. 4.

Grillparzer-Studien. Beiträge zur Grillparzerforschung von R. Backmann, M. Enzinger u. a. *Wien:* Gerlach & Wiedling, 1923.

Gundolf, Friedr.—Dichter und Helden. 2. Aufl. *Heidelberg:* Weiss, 1923. 79 pp. M. 1.50.

Holl, Karl. — Geschichte des deutschen Lustspiels. *Leipzig:* J. J. Weber, 1923. 368 pp.

Huber-Bindschedler, Berta.—Die Motivierung in den Dramen von J. M. R. Lenz. Diss. *Zürich:* 1923. 156 pp.

Krappe, A. H.—The legend of Rodrick, last of the Visigoth kings and the Ermanarich cycle. *Heidelberg:* Winter, 1923. 64 pp.

Kuske, Bruno.—Der Einfluss der Rufnamen auf die Entstehung der Familiennamen. *Köln:* Gilsbach & Co., 1923. 28 pp. M. 0.30.

Lehmann, Karl.—Junge deutsche Dramatiker. Eine Einführung in die Gedankenwelt des neuen Dramas. *Leipzig:* Dieterich, 1923. vi + 72 pp.

Lersch, Philipp.—Der Traum in der deutschen Romantik. *München:* M. Hueber, 1923. viii + 137 pp. M. 4.50.

May, Kurt.—Lessings u. Herders kunsttheoretische Gedanken in ihrem Zusammenhang [Germ. Studien. H. 25]. *Berlin:* Ebering, 1923. 150 pp.

Mohrhenn, Alfred. — Friedrich Hebbels Sonette. [Hebbel-Forschungen, Nr. 11]. *Berlin:* B. Behr, 1923. 134 pp. M. 2.80.

Montgomery, Marshall. — Friedrich Hölderlin and the German Neo-Hellenic Movement. Part I: From the Renaissance to the Thalia-Fragment of Hölderlin's 'Hyperion' (1794). *New York:* Oxford Univ. Press, 1923. vi + 232 pp. $4.20.

Pigenot, Ludw. v.—Hölderlin. Das Wesen u. d. Schau. *München:* Bruckmann, 1923. 166 pp. M. 3.20.

Rheinisches Wörterbuch. Auf Grund der von J. Franck begonnenen Samml. hrsg. v. Jos. Müller. Bd. 1, Lfg. 1. A-als. *Bonn u. Leipzig:* K. Schroeder, 1923. vi + 128 cols. 4°. M. 2.

Schlegel, Friedrich. — Der Briefwechsel Friedrich u. Dorothea Schlegels 1818-1820. hrsg. v. H. Finke. *Kempten:* J. Kösel & F. Pustet, 1923. xxxiii + 373 pp. M. 10.50.

Schnyder, Walter.—Hebbel und Rötscher unter bes. Berücksichtigung der beiderseitigen Beziehungen zu Hegel. [Hebbel-Forschungen, Nr. 10]. *Berlin:* B. Behr, 1923. 158 pp. M. 3.

Schregle, Hans.—Goethes Gottfried von Berlichingen. [Handbücherei f. d. deu. Unterr. I, 4]. *Halle:* Niemeyer, 1923. iv + 168 pp. M. 2.

Seemann, Erich. — Hugo von Trimberg und die Fabeln seines Renners. Eine Untersuchung z. Gesch. d. Tierfabel im MA. [Münchener Archiv II. 6.] *München:* Callwey, 1923. 308 pp.

Sommerfeld, Martin.—Hebbel und Goethe. Studien z. Geschichte des deutschen Klassizismus im 19. Jh. *Bonn:* F. Cohen, 1923. 275 pp.

Steiner, Emil.—Die französischen Lehnwörter in den alemannischen Mundarten der Schweiz. Kulturhistorisch-linguistische Untersuchung mit etymol. Wbch. *Basel:* Wepf. Schwabe & Co., 1923. 600 pp. Fr. 18.

Stolze, Reinhold.—Kleists Käthchen von Heilbronn auf der deutschen Bühne. [Germanische Studien, H. 27.]. *Berlin:* Ebering, 1923. iii + 118 pp. M. 3.60.

Wien, Wilh.—Goethe und die Physik. Vortrag. *Leipzig:* Joh. Ambr. Barth, 1923. 39 pp.

Wrede, Ferd.—Zu den Merseburger Zaubersprüchen. [Sitzungsber. d. preuss. Akad. d. Wiss. Phil.-hist. Kl. 1923, Nr. 14.] *Berlin:* de Gruyter & Co., 1923. Pp. 85-90.

Zerkaulen, Heinr.—Theodor Körners Liebesfrühling. *Berlin-Lichterfelde:* E. Runge [1923]. 47 pp.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

FRENCH

Anthologie des écr. fr. du XIXe siècle, publ. par Gauthier-Ferrières. I. *Paris:* Larousse, 1923. 2 vols. 170 + 162 pp.

Barrès, M.—L'Angoisse de Pascal. Les deux maisons de P. à Clermont-Ferrand. *Paris:* Plon-Nourrit, 1923. 107 pp. 5 fr.

—— Dante, Pascal et Renan. *Ibid.*, 1923. 85 pp. 5 fr.

Boysonné, J. de.—Les Trois Centuries, éd. crit. de H. Jacoubet. Thèse compl. *Toulouse:* Privat, 1923. 224 pp.

Bovée, A. G.—Teachers' Manual for Première Année de Français. *New York:* Ginn, 1923. 66 pp.

Centenaire de G. Flaubert et de L. Bouilhet. *Rouen:* Impr. de la Vicomté, 1923. 65 pp.

Chamaillard. — Pascal mondain et amoureux. *Paris:* Presses Univ., 1923. 475 pp. Fr. 10.

Cornilleau, R. — Types et silhouettes. [Déroulède, Barbey d'Aurevilly, &c.] *Mamers:* Enault, (1923). 153 pp. Fr. 3.50.

Deschamps E.—La préface des études fr. et étrangères, ed. by H. Girard. *Paris:* Presses fr., (1924) (Bibl. Romantique).

Faguet, E.—Hist. de la Poésie fr. de la Renaissance au Romantisme, avant-propos de F. Strowski. *Paris:* Boivin, (1923). xxiv + 416 pp. Fr. 9.

Franchet, H. — Le poète et son œuvre d'après Ronsard. *Paris:* Champion, 1923. xi + 356 pp.

Garnier, R.—Œuvres complètes, éd. par L. Pinvert. *Paris:* Garnier, 1923. 2 vols. lxvi + 347 + 458 pp. Fr. 15.

Gosset, P.—Le Théâtre à Reims pendant la Révolution. *Reims:* Monce, 1922. 24 pp.

Gourmont, Jean de et R. D. Donne. — Bibliographie des Œuvres de Remy de Gourmont. *Paris:* Leclerc, 1922. 72 pp.

Hugo, V.—Le Contemplations ed. par J. Vianey. *Paris:* Hachette, 1922. 3 vols. cxliv + 174 + 429 + 500 pp. Fr. 30.

Hutchison, E. W.—Le Chevalier de Blanchefleur et autres pièces. *New York:* Heath, 1919. 131 pp. 48 cts.

Le Harivel, P. — Nicolas de Bonneville, préromantique et révolutionnaire. 1760-1828. Strasbourg diss. *New York:* Oxford Press, 1923. ix + 199 pp.

Lespinasse, Mlle de.—Lettres. *Paris:* A. Michel, 1923. 135 pp. Fr. 2.

Martino, P.—Le Naturalisme fr. *Paris:* Colin, 1923. 224 pp. Fr. 5.

Moore and Bennett. — La France qui chante. *Boston:* D. C. Heath (1924). x + 122 pp. $1.40.

Musset. — Lettres d'amour, éd. par H. Frichet. *Paris:* Nilsson (1923). 125 pp.

Nadaud, G.—Pages choisies, ed. by J. de La Rue. *Lille:* Soc. Saint-Augustin, 1923. 288 pp.

Pailleron, M. L.—Fr. Buloz et ses amis. *Paris:* Perrin, 1923. 257 pp.

Rudler, G.—Les techniques de la critique et de l'histoire littéraires en litt. fr. moderne. *New York:* Oxford Press. xv + 204 pp. $2.85.

Tielrooy, J.—C. B. Huet et la litt. fr. *Paris:* Champion, 1923. xii + 300 pp.

Trotain, M.—Les scènes historiques, étude du théâtre livresque à la veille du drame romantique. Bryn Mawr diss. *Paris:* Champion, 1923. 75 pp.

Villers, S. de. — Lucie-Delarue Mardrus. *Paris:* Sansot, 1923. 40 pp. Fr. 2.

ITALIAN

Alighieri, Dante.—La Divina Commedia, riveduta sul testo della società dantesca italiana a cura di Guido Biagi. *Firenze:* G. C. Sansoni, 1923. 515 pp. L. 5.

Biagi, G.—Passatisti. *Firenze:* Soc. ed. "La Voce," 1923. 251 pp. L. 11.

Biscottini, U. — Fiorita di poesie còrse. Scelta, introduzione e note di —. *Torino:* Direzione ed. opere r. Orfanotrofio militare nazionale, 1923. 92 pp. L. 4.50.

Boccazzi, G.—La poesia di Ettore Sanfelice. Tesi presentata alla facoltà di lettere dell'università di Friburgo (Svizzera). *Milano:* A. Pavone e C., 1923. 189 pp.

Collino, L.—Leggenda manzoniana (1873-1923). *Torino:* G. B. Paravia e C., 1923. 41 pp. L. 2.50.

Crispolti, F.—Il canto XII del Paradiso, letto nella casa di Dante in Roma il dì 27 gennajo 1923. *Firenze:* G. C. Sansoni, 1923. 35 pp. L. 3. (Lectura Dantis.)

Del Lungo, I.—Per la lingua d'Italia un vecchio accademico della Crusca. *Bologna:* N. Zanichelli, 1923. 197 pp. L. 7.50.

Donati, Eleonora.—I racconti di Temistocle Gradi. *Bologna:* Scuola tip. Salesiana, 1923. 35 pp.

Foscolo, Ugo.—Lettere d'amore. *Milano:* Facchi, 1922. 224 pp. L. 1.95. (L'ideale: collezione dei libri più letti, no. 1.)

Gallamini, Carolina.—Fiori d'anima. Commentando alcune poesie di G. Pascoli. *Ravenna:* 1923. 15 pp.

Gliozzi, E.—Il parlare calabrese e l'italiano. Confronti. Manualetto per l'insegnamento della lingua nelle province calabresi, con saggi dialettali e vocabolarietto. *Torino:* Soc. ed. Internazionale, 1923. 118 pp. L. 3.

Gorio, Marcella.—Un poeta milanese del '600: Carlo Maria Maggi. *Parma:* Donati, 1922. vi + 129 + xxvii pp.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

Jacopone da Todi.—Le laude. Ristampa integrale della prima edizione (1490). Con prefazione di Giovanni Papini. *Firenze:* Libr. ed. Fiorentina, 1923. xxvii + 329 pp. L. 10.

Leanti, G.—Una poetessa della patria e del dolore. Mariannina Coffa-Caruso (1848-1878). *Noto:* Tip. Zammit, 1923. x + 237 pp. L. 10.

Manzoni, Alessandro.—Scritti sulla lingua italiana, per cura di G. Lesca. *Firenze:* G. Barbèra, 1923. xvii + 419 pp. L. 8. (Collezione Diamante.)

Manzoniana. Numero unico (maggio 1923). *Lecco:* E. Bartolozzi, 1923. 24 pp. L. 2.

Ottolini, A. — Antologia della lirica italiana, a cura di —. *Milano:* R. Caddeo e C., 1923. 483 pp. L. 12. (Collezione universale di letteratura, arti e cultura, ni. 95-100.)

Perini, C.—Vita di Alessandro Manzoni, narrata per il 50° anniversario della sua morte. *Lecco:* Tip. del "Resegone," 1923. 68 pp. L. 2.

Pietrobono, L.—Dal centro al cerchio. La struttura morale della Divina Commedia. *Torino:* Soc. ed. Internazionale, 1923. xii + 311 pp. L. 10.

Reichenbach, G.—Gaspara Stampa. *Roma:* A. F. Formíggini, 1923. 67 pp. L. 3.50. (Profili, n. 3.)

Rossi, G.—Melchiorre Cesarotti critico e poeta. *Salerno:* Coop. "Il Tipografo salernitano" ed., 1923. 126 pp. L. 8.

Rumor, S. — Ricordi manzoniani a Vicenza. *Vicenza:* Tip. Vicentina, 1923. 39 pp.

Tribaudino, Luisa.—Riflessione sul carme dei Sepolcri. *Casale Monf.:* Tip. Pezzana e Calvi, 1923. 15 pp.

Ursoleo, E.—Giuseppe Battista. Contributo alla storia della letteratura e della critica del secolo XVII. *Pescara:* Stab. "Arte della stampa," 1922. 69 pp.

Zambetti, A.—Il paese dei Promessi Sposi. Edizione a cura del comitato per la celebrazione manzoniana. *Lecco:* Tip. del Commercio, 1923. 34 pp.

SPANISH

Ayala, J. R.—Teoría aritmética del ritmo. *Caracas:* Empresa editorial, 1923. 51 pp.

Campillo y Correa, N.—Cartas y poesías inéditas de don —, dirigidas a don Eduardo de la Barra. Noticias interesantes y curiosas acerca de Gustavo A. Becquer y del verdadero e ingenioso autor de las Historias de la Corte Celestial, con documentos que resuelven definitivamente esta cuestión literaria. Publicadas con un prólogo por L. Eliz. *Valparaíso:* Impr. Roma, 1923. 54 pp.

Caro, M. A.—Obras completas. Tomo IV: Edición oficial hecha bajo la dirección de V. E. Caro y A. Gómez Restrepo. *Bogotá:* Impr. Nacional, 1923. xx + 428 pp.

Caro, V. E.—Reflexiones acerca del soneto. *Bogotá:* Editorial Minerva, 1923. 42 pp. (Academia Colombiana de la Lengua.)

Castex, E. R.—Cantos populares. Apuntes lexicográficos. *Buenos Aires:* "La Lectura," 1923. 156 pp.

Coster, A. — Luis de León (1528-1591). *Tours:* Impr. E. Arrault et Cie., 1922. 2 vols. (Repr. fr. the "Revue hispanique," LIII.)

Chaves Nogales, M. — Ensayos. Sevilla. *Córdoba:* "La Voz de Córdoba," 1921. 160 pp.

Icaza, F. A. de.—El "Quijote" durante tres siglos. *Madrid:* Fortanet, 1918. 229 pp.

Juderías, J.—Don Francisco de Quevedo y Villegas. La época, el hombre, las doctrinas. Obra premiada con accésit por la Real Academia de Ciencias Morales y Políticas en el concurso ordinario de 1917. *Madrid:* J. Ratés, 1922. 269 pp.

Méndez Bejarano, M. — Diccionario de escritores, maestros y oradores naturales de Sevilla y su actual provincia. Tomo I (A-LL). *Sevilla:* Tip. Gironés, 1922. xi + 471 pp.

Millé Jiménez, J. — Lope de Vega, traductor de Claudiano. *Buenos Aires:* Impr. Araujo hermanos, 1923. 10 pp. (Repr. from "Verbum," XVII, 60.)

Montalvo, F.—Simón Bolívar. *Hamburg:* Deutscher Auslandverlag Walter Bangert, 1922. 83 pp. (Colección Bangert, 2.)

Muñoz Morillejo, J.—Escenografía española. *Madrid:* Impr. Blass, 1923. 311 pp.

Poncet y de Cárdenas, C.—José Jacinto Milanés y su obra poética. *La Habana:* Impr. "El Siglo XX," 1923. 42 pp. (Repr. fr. "Cuba Contemporánea," 1923.)

Ramírez de Arellano, R.—Ensayo de un Catálogo biográfico de escritores de la provincia y diócesis de Córdoba, con descripción de sus obras. Obra premiada por la Biblioteca Nacional en el concurso público de 1916. 2 vols., viii + 705, 322 pp.

Rufo, Juan.—Las seiscientas apotegmas y otras obras en verso de —, Jurado de Córdoba. Publícalas la Sociedad de Bibliófilos Españoles. Introducción de Agustín G. de Amezúa. *Madrid:* Impr. de Ramona Velasco, 1923. cxvi + 314 pp.

Santa Cruz y Espejo, F. J. E.—Escritos. Tomo tercero. Editado por J. Jijón y Caamaño y H. Viteri Lafronte. Introducción de H. Viteri Lafronte. *Quito:* Editorial Artes Gráficas, 1923. lvi + 322 pp.

Selgas.—El Libro del centenario de —. *Murcia:* "El Tiempo," 1923. 178 pp.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

Volume XXXIX APRIL, 1924 Number 4

MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES

EDITED BY

JAMES WILSON BRIGHT, Editor-in-Chief

GUSTAV GRUENBAUM WILLIAM KURRELMEYER

H. CARRINGTON LANCASTER

CONTENTS

CLARK, H. H.—A Study of Melancholy in Edward Young. Part II, - 193
FLOM, G. T.—Place-Name Tests of Racial Mixture in Northern England, - 203
BRAUNE, W.—Die Neudrucke Deutscher Literaturwerke, - - - 212
NITZE, W. A.—The Sources of the Ninth Sonnet of 'Les Regrets,' - - 216
MARTIN, R. G.—The Sources of Heywood's 'If You Know Not Me, You Know Nobody,' Part I, - - - - - - - - 220
MALONE, K.—King Aun in the Rök Inscription, - - - - - - 223
MABBOTT, T. O.—A New Poem by Thomas Chatterton, - - - - 226

Reviews:—

FERDINAND BRUNOT, La Pensée et la Langue. [*A. Schinz.*] - - - 229
LUCIUS L. HUBBARD, A Dutch Source for *Robinson Crusoe*. [*A. H. Nethercot.*] - - - - - - - - - - - 235
JOHN BERESFORD, The Poems of Charles Cotton 1630-1697. [*B. G. Clough.*] - - - - - - - - - - - 241

Correspondence:—

TAYLOR, PAULINE, Birnam Wood: 700 A D.–1600 A. D., - - - 244
IBERSHOFF, C. H., Bodmer Indebted to Dante, - - - - - - 247
VAN ROOSBROECK, G. L., Uncollected Poems by Fontenelle, - - - 249
KAYE, F. B., La Rochefoucauld and the Character of Zimri, - - - 251
PECK, W. E., Keats, Shelley, and Mrs. Radcliffe, - - - - - 251

Brief Mention:—

NORMAN FOERSTER and J. M. STEADMAN, Sentences and Thinking;—
HYDER E. ROLLINS, *A Handful of Pleasant Delights*, - - - - 252

THE JOHNS HOPKINS PRESS
BALTIMORE

Eight Numbers a Year — Single Copy (Current) Sixty-five Cents

Entered as Second-Class Matter at the Baltimore, Maryland, Postoffice

Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103, Act of October 3, 1917. Authorized on July 3, 1918

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES

A MONTHLY PUBLICATION with intermission from July to October (inclusive)

This publication is devoted to linguistic and literary research and to æsthetic and philosophic criticism in the domain of English, German, and the related Germanic Languages; and of French, Italian, Spanish, and the other Languages of the Romance Group. Its purpose is also to promote sound methods in the teaching of the Modern Languages and Literatures.

The Subscription Price of the current annual volume is $5.00 for the United States and Mexico; Canada $5.25 and $5.50 for other countries included in the Postal Union.

Contributors and Publishers will please address matter for the English Department of the *Notes* to James W. Bright; for the German Department to William Kurrelmeyer; for the French Department to H. Carrington Lancaster; for the Italian and Spanish Departments to Gustav Gruenbaum. Other matter may be sent to the Editor-in-Chief. The address of all the editors is Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md.

Subscriptions and other business communications should be sent to the Johns Hopkins Press, Baltimore, Md.

PREPARATION OF COPY

All copy should be in typewritten form.

Underscore (for italics) all titles of books, periodicals, poems, plays and other separately published compositions.

Use numerals in designating foot-notes, and number foot-notes in unbroken sequence.

Use roman numerals for volume-reference, set off by a comma before a following page-reference.

LES TECHNIQUES DE LA CRITIQUE ET DE L'HISTOIRE LITTÉRAIRES EN LITTÉRATURE FRANÇAISE MODERNE.

Par GUSTAVE RUDLER.

Designed to give beginners in literary research a knowledge of the best technical methods for ensuring that their collection of facts shall be rapid, accurate, orderly, and fruitful in results. $2.85

THE GENIUS OF SPAIN AND OTHER ESSAYS ON SPANISH CONTEMPORARY LITERATURE.

By SALVADOR DE MADARIAGA.

The aim of these nine essays is to exhibit the character and genius of Spain, and, by typical examples, the various capacities of its provinces. The author has command of several European literatures and lifts his subject to the point where all literatures meet. Net $3.35:

OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS
American Branch
35 WEST 32ND STREET, NEW YORK

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES

VOLUME XXXIX APRIL, 1924 NUMBER 4

A STUDY OF MELANCHOLY IN EDWARD YOUNG

PART II.

It will be recalled that Part I, after surveying Young's life for saddening influences, established the general proposition that happiness usually results from a mediation between extremes and, conversely, that a failure to mediate and compromise between extremes invites unhappiness or melancholy. The first cause of Young's melancholy, as derived from his philosophy, was found to lie in his disdain of the world because of sorrow, ennui resulting from an exasperated quest for novelty, and failure to win the preferment to which he thought himself entitled. This brings us to his love of solitude, which may be considered a *second* cause for his dejection.[1] When Young praises night he means solitude.[2] For in his nocturnal habits he finds a double solitude,—both physical and moral. The darkness does indeed separate him from his fellows, but probably he enjoyed much more than this the thought which he expresses as follows:

> "Let Indians and the gay, like Indians, fond
> Of feathered fopperies, the sun adore;
> Darkness has more divinity for me." [3]

[1] It may be objected that solitude is the result rather than the cause of melancholy, following the principle "Laugh and the world laughs with you; weep, and you weep alone." This is of course true in some cases. However, even though it is natural for a depressed person to seek solitude, this does not prevent solitude, which thwarts the gregarious instinct so fundamental in man, from intensifying the initial melancholy by reaction.

[2] *Cf. Night Thoughts*, v, 171-72.

[3] *Ibid.*, v, 126-28.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

He thought that there was something distinctive—and therefore superior—in his midnight watches. No doubt his desire to be distinctive in this way was derived from his theory of original genius and was one of the incentives to his love of solitude. Again, in his praise of night we have another example of his love of melancholy suggestions,—he preferred night to day because, among other advantages, it was more melancholy.

> "How like a widow in her weeds, the night,
> Amid her glimmering tapers, silent sits!
> How sorrowful, how desolate, she weeps
> Perpetual dews, and saddens nature's scenes!"[4]

It is perhaps natural for a melancholy person to choose melancholy surroundings; it is also natural, however, that these surroundings should react upon and deepen the original melancholy.

Two other reasons may be given to account for this preference for solitude. First, Young thinks that solitude nourishes virtue.

> "Virtue, for ever frail as fair below,
> Her tender nature suffers in the crowd,
> Nor touches in the world without a stain;
> The world's infectious."[5]

Here we have the germs of a doctrine which was later to deny the struggle between good and evil within the breast of the individual and assert that every evil thing comes from without, from society. Young, however, did not go to any such extreme; according to his view, it is man's "stubborn Will," tempted by the world, which is his only obstacle to salvation, and he can change this will if he chooses. In respect to his love of solitude, however, Young is certainly gravitating toward the later romantic extreme.[6]

The second reason why he is so "studious of sequester'd scenes"

[4] *Ibid.*, IX, 1978-81. Also V, 78-79.

[5] *Night Thoughts*, V, 139-142. Cf. V, 163-65; V, 177.

[6] The position of the humanist on this point is perhaps best expressed by Emerson in the *Essay on Self-Reliance:* "It is easy in the world to live after the world's opinion; it is easy in solitude to live after our own; but the great man is he who in the midst of the crowd keeps with perfect sweetness the independence of solitude." Young's praise of friendship (*N. T.* II, 460 ff.) may be objected as a case in point against solitude. Here he opposes what he says in note 7 and 8. Cf. "Friendship, the Means of Wisdom" (503), with 7 and 8.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

is that he thinks solitude inspires wisdom,—wisdom of the unearthly ecstatic type which ends in melancholy.

> "O sacred solitude! divine retreat!
> Choice of the prudent! Envy of the great!
> By thy pure stream, or in the wavy shade,
> We court fair wisdom, that celestial maid." [7]

This conception is closely related to Young's attitude toward nature; he is not pantheistic, but considers nature the handiwork of the "stupendous Architect," and therefore nature serves as a sort of intermediary to teach the ways of God to man.

> "Nature, Thy daughter, ever-changing birth
> Of Thee the great Immutable, to man
> Speaks wisdom; is his oracle supreme;
> And he who most consults her is most wise." [8]

The handiwork of God is considered as a set of symbols for man, and is taken as proof of man's immortality.

> " . . . . All, to re-flourish, fades;
> As in a wheel, all sinks, to reascend;
> Emblems of man, who passes, not expires." [9]

But on close examination it is evident that this communion with nature is but a disguised form of his melancholy in regard to this world, and an excuse to escape on the viewless wings of his imagination.

> " . . . . . I bless Night's consecrating shades,
> Which to a temple turn a universe,
> Fill us with great ideas full of heaven,
> And antidote the pestilential earth." [10]

It is significant that the reaction from an ecstatic revery of this sort only serves to intensify his gloom, and leads to the opposite extreme.[11]

This brings us to a consideration of what may be called the *third* cause of melancholy in Young's philosophy,—his emancipa-

[7] *Love of Fame*, Satire v, 255-58.
[8] *Night Thoughts*, vi, 671-74.
[9] *Ibid.*, vi, 687-89.
[10] *Ibid.*, ix, 1349-53. See also ix, 766-770.
[11] For example, see ix, 2411-2418.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

tion of the imagination in the quest of the remote, the vague, and the unknown. One has a lingering suspicion that his interest in religion is not principally for its religious values, but rather because it offers a "fairyland of fancy" where his expansive imagination may "wander wild" and "reign arbitrarily over its own empire of chimeras."[12] It is perhaps significant that in his description of his heavenly flights he exclaims,

> "Far from my native element I roam,
> In quest of New and Wonderful to man."[13]

All this is, of course, closely related to his doctrine of original genius. There can be little doubt that the quest of novelty and imaginative expansion plays a large part in his love of religious broodings. This is clear in the following quotation:

> "The soul of man was made to walk the skies;
> Delightful outlet of her prison here!
> There, disencumber'd from her chains, and ties
> Of toys terrestrial, she can rove at large;
> There freely can respire, dilate, extend,
> In full proportion let loose all her powers,
> And, undeluded, grasp at something great."[14]

A *fourth* cause of Young's melancholy may be found in his peculiar religious views; these are but the complement of his attitude toward the world, his love of solitude, and his use of the imagination as a means of escape. He represents a transition from deism to romantic pantheism; he is deistic in regarding God as the architect of nature, but pantheistic in his tendency to substitute passive emotional revery under the stars for active spiritual meditation. His religion casts a dark shadow upon the life here and now, and leads him

> "To frown at pleasure, and to smile at pain,

---

[12] *Conjectures on Original Composition*, p. 18. The "empire of chimeras" became the ivory tower of later romanticism. Young's longing for something infinitely remote is in many respects similar to Shelley's "Desire of the moth for the star."

[13] *Night Thoughts*, IX, 1758-59. Lack of novelty, it will be recalled, was one reason for his attitude toward the world. Cf. also *Ibid.*, VII, 512-20—"Sateless thirst for pleasure, gold and fame" prove man born for "blessings infinite."

[14] *Ibid.*, IX, 1018-24.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

> Fired at the prospect of unclouded bliss."[15]

It is thus that death becomes the "crown of life," and the contemplation of death man's greatest inspiration. But the substitute for genuine religion which Young proposes, namely revery, is hollow; it does not give permanent religious peace, but rather only a disguised form of introspection which results in melancholy. This, however, is far too complex a subject to treat in a paper of this length.

One of Young's objects in writing *Night Thoughts* was to rebuke Pope's omission of immortality from his *Essay on Man.* He was principally opposed, however, to the assumption of the Shaftesburian moralists that virtue is its own reward and in need of no future recompense. For Young the hope of immortality is the one and only incentive for leading a virtuous life.

> "Virtue's a combat; and who fights for nought,
> Or for precarious or small reward?"[16]

And if there is no immortality, then

> "Sense! take the rein; blind Passion! drive us on."[17]
> "Yes; give the Pulse full empire; live the Brute
> Since as the Brute we die."[18]

This view is entirely consistent with his tendency to go to extremes. Even were we certain that there is no existence beyond the grave, no change would occur in our estimate of what is ethically right and wrong; our standards would remain unchanged, for we have no evidence that what is truly best for this life is inimical to the interests of the future.[19]

Young held that mercy is not, as the deists implied, the sole attribute of God. He pictures Hell with a vividness which would make jealous even a Jonathan Edwards. After a delectable description of the abodes of the blessed, he turns to the domain of the damned.

> "Hell, bursting, belches forth her blazing seas,

---

[15] *Night Thoughts*, VIII, 1054-55 ff.

[16] *Night Thoughts*, VII, 241-42; see also IX, 379; VII, 1178; VII, 177-180.

[17] *Ibid.*, VII, 729.

[18] *Ibid.*, VII, 732.

[19] This is the view taken by Mr. Everett, in his *Moral Values* (N. Y. 1918), p. 400.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

And storms sulphureous, her voracious jaws
Expanding wide, and roaring for her prey." [20]

Doubtless a prospect like this would make a sinner somewhat melancholy. It is a commentary on Young's egoism that he evidently had no question as to his fitness for eternal bliss, for he awaits with much anticipation the "day for which all other days were made," while he exclaims about the rarity of salvation.

His religious views reach their climax near the end of the *Night Thoughts:*

"Joy breaks, shines, triumphs; 'tis eternal day,
Shall that which rises out of nought complain
Of few evils, paid with endless joys?" [21]

But he has told us earlier of the reaction which is caused by his celestial reveries:

"Or is it feeble Nature calls me back,
And breaks my spirit into grief again?
Is it a Stygian vapour in my blood,
A cold, slow puddle creeping through my veins?
Or is it thus with all men?—Thus with all.
What are we? how unequal! now we soar,
And now we sink. To be the same, transcends
Our present prowess." [22]

Here, once more, an inability to mediate between extremes has caused his unhappiness.[23]

The ultimate source of Young's escape to extremes lies in his conception of original genius; this may be considered the *fifth* cause of melancholy resulting from his philosophy. It is, indeed, by no mere coincidence that the classic of melancholy and the classic of original genius should come from the same author, for the underlying idea in the conception of original genius is a flight

[20] *Night Thoughts*, IX, 185-87. Young sternly denounced the idea of man's natural goodness; in fact, the orthodox could not oppose Mandeville on this point without violating their accepted theology. See also IX, 336-350.

[21] *Night Thoughts*, IX, 2379-81. Cf. Thomas, *op. cit.*, p. 457: "Telle est le mot final de l'auteur."

[22] *Ibid.*, V, 216.

[23] For a scathing treatment of Young's religion, see George Eliot's essay on "Worldliness and Other-Worldliness" in *Leaves in a Notebook.*

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

to extremes, and this, as I have tried to show, is the fundamental cause of Young's melancholy. The essence of the doctrine, as held by Young, is given in a single sentence:

"All eminence, and distinction, lies out of the beaten road; excursion, and deviation, are necessary to find it; and the more remote your path from the highway, the more reputable." [24]

This theory of original genius is the key to practically the whole of Young's philosophy; it is the unifying center—the nucleus—around which his work may be related. For the most part, it accounts for his disdain of the world, "the beaten road"; for his love of solitude, "the remote"; for his love of "excursion" by means of the untrammelled imagination; and for his flight from genuine spiritual activity to emotional revery under the stars. And it is also at the base of three more important characteristics with which I have yet to deal.

First, the conception of original genius is closely associated with the theory of the master-passion,—another modification of going to an extreme. A man must try to develop some one side of his nature; he must give all his attention and effort to some one pursuit.

"As for a general genius, there is no such thing in nature: A genius implies the rays of the mind concenter'd and determined to some particular point; when they are scatter'd widely, they act feebly, and strike not with sufficient force, to fire, or dissolve, the heart." [25]

In other words, one must be a specialist. The contrast to the man of the golden mean—"l'honnête homme qui ne se pique de rien"—is obvious. The object of an Aristotelian decorum, imposed in the interest of moderation and poise and proportion, is to make one more human, and therefore happier. The humanist aims first of all not to be original, but human; and to be human one needs to look up to a sound model and imitate it; this is also part of the Christian tradition. Now Young denounced imitation in the literary field; in his *Conjectures* he does not go to the extreme of applying his principle to life in general, but clearly the tendency is in that direction.

[24] *Conjectures on Original Composition*, p. 11. This is, of course, the converse of his denunciation of imitation.

[25] *Conjectures on Original Composition*, p. 37.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

"By a spirit of Imitation we counteract nature, and thwart her design. She brings us into the world all Originals . . . . Born Originals, how comes it to pass that we die Copies? That meddling ape Imitation . . . . destroys all mental individuality." [26]

The second consequence of the conception of original genius is the tendency to disparage logic and learning in the interest of spontaneity. Young has generally been regarded as a rationalist, and in his choice of reason over sense, going, as usual, to one extreme or the other, this may be just.[27] It is significant, however, that he disdains all the means by which true rationality is usually acquired. "Genius needs not go to school." [28] And genius means, for the most part, simply "the power of accomplishing great things without the means generally reputed to be necessary to that end." [29] The grandeurs of nature prove the existence of a deity without recourse to "logic's thorns." [30]

"Not deeply to discern, nor much to know,
Mankind was born to Wonder and Adore." [31]

It is reason which Young constantly proposes as a means of restraint for the expansive desires; it is open to question, however, whether reason, as he conceives it, is not itself expansive.

"Reason is man's peculiar; Sense, the Brute's.
The Present is the scanty realm of Sense;
The Future, Reason's empire unconfined." [32]

The third consequence of the conception of original genius, and the last with which I shall deal, is egoism and introspection,—the escape into one's self. It will be recalled that he said all eminence

[26] *Ibid.*, pp. 19-20.

[27] See *Night Thoughts*, VIII, 856-62—sense and reason at "eternal war." His choice of reason is due to the thought expressed in note 32. To the view that Young is a rationalist, VI, 428, may be objected. However, his philosophy taken as a whole, is strongly rationalistic, and he heaps coals of fire on the heads of those "sold to sense." Cf. VIII, 1338; also VIII, 869. It is interesting to find that he scorns sense chiefly because it is able to yield only "leaden iteration." (III, 373-75.)

[28] *Night Thoughts*, VIII, 330.

[29] *Conjectures*, p. 13.

[30] *Night Thoughts*, IX, 866 ff. This is related, obviously, to his nature cult.

[31] *Ibid.*, IX, 1874-75. Cf. Dr. Johnson, "All wonder is the effect of novelty upon Ignorance."

[32] *Ibid.*, VII, 1432-34.

Digitized by Google
Original from
UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

and distinction lay out of the beaten road; thus the desire for superiority was obviously an important motive in his program of distinctiveness. He is proud of those things in which he is peculiar, unprecedented, and unique; thus it happens that the poet is driven into solitude, and in praising solitude he praises his own superiority. Young's conception of solitude and genius thus become directly contributory to his egoism. Furthermore, as DeQuincey has noted,[33] Young is too circumscribed in his sympathies, too narrow, too illiberal, too exclusive. George Eliot, with few exceptions, finds "hardly a trace of human sympathy or of self-forgetfulness, in the joy or sorrow of a fellow-being." [34] This is evident in his religious views.

> "In self-applause is Virtue's golden prize." [35]
> "Virtue is true self-interest pursued." [36]

An important corollary of Young's egoism [37] and his cult of the master-passion, implicit in the conception of the original genius, is his intense desire for fame, in spite of all his harangues against it. In fact, it is significant that one reason why he objects to imitation is that "An imitator shares his crown, if he has one, with the chosen object of his imitation; an original enjoys an undivided applause." [38] He conceives of the press as "the Fountain of Fame," and it is quite clear that the desire of fame is the main incentive to literary composition.[39] We have seen that he never secured the fame to which he thought himself entitled.

Perhaps the most important consequence of the original genius theory as regards Young, is introspection, resulting in the personal quality of his melancholy. Deeply significant in his love of night is the fact that

> "It strikes thought inward; it drives back the soul
> To settle on herself, our point supreme." [40]

---

[33] *On Wordsworth's Poetry.*

[34] Eliot, *op. cit.*, p. 48.

[35] *Night Thoughts*, VII, 148.

[36] *Ibid.*, VII, 143.

[37] As an example of egoism arising from the conviction that he is unique, see VIII, 1089-1094.

[38] *Conjectures*, p. 7.

[39] *Ibid.*, p. 4. Also cf. *Love of Fame*, etc., Satire I, 51-56. Also *Night Thoughts*, VII, 405-11.

[40] *Night Thoughts*, V, 129.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

In the *Conjectures,* written for application to literary composition but with a much wider connotation, "self-knowledge" and "self reverence" are laid down as the two great virtues.[41] We have seen that one important cause of his melancholy was sorrow. Now genuine sorrow—and much of Young's is genuine—commands respect. However, we suspect that he crosses the border line when sorrow becomes a mark of superiority,—when he says,

"His grief is but his graudeur in disguise."[42]

This is directly related to the doctrine of original genius, for Young, in his conviction that he was unique, becomes unique in feeling, and therefore in suffering,—evidently following the principle, stated by Walpole, that life is a comedy for those who think and a tragedy for those who feel. Thus his grief separates him from his fellows, makes him different, and therefore ministers to his egoism. The uniqueness of his grief gives rise to what M. Thomas calls "un cri d'angoisse tout personnel. . . . Ce qui manque à ces effusions pathétiques, ce n'est pas la sincérité mais l'universalité de l'émotion."[43] It is "une douleur profonde et personnelle."[44] And there lies a deep significance in the fact that, after the neo-classic artificiality, the return of "I" to literature,—the subjective, introspective tone—should be inseparably linked to the return of melancholy.[45]

Harry H. Clark.

Harvard University.

---

[41] *Conjectures,* p. 24.

[42] *Night Thoughts,* VII, 53, cf. V, 558-560.

[43] Thomas, *op cit.,* p. 458; M. Thomas notes one exception, I, 238.

[44] *Ibid.,* p. 308. M. Thomas evidently attributes Young's melancholy to his subjective nature.

[45] Young has been accused of hypocrisy by George Eliot, and Chateaubriand questioned the genuineness of his melancholy. However, those who have studied his work carefully believe his melancholy to be sincere. In *Aus Meinem Leben,* Bk. XIII, Goethe writes in retrospect, but clearly he means that the impression of melancholy given by Young was a truthful one, although somewhat exaggerated by those who received it. Sir Leslie Stephen says, "His emotion was genuine and poignant, though mingled with affectation." (*Critic,* vol. 41, 1902, p. 341.) M. Thomas says, "Cette supposition est non moins injurieuse que peu vraisemblable." (*op. cit.,* p. 458.)

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

PLACE-NAME TESTS OF RACIAL MIXTURE IN NORTHERN ENGLAND

§ 1. The racial elements evidenced in the place-names of northern England, besides the native English, are the Scandinavian, the Celtic, the Norman-French, and the Roman. For northern England, taken as a whole, the order of importance of these is as here given; and it is that also for all the counties, and usually that for the various hundreds and parishes of the different counties. The English element is the dominant one; but the Scandinavian element is very large, by no means equally so, however, for the different regions. It is proportionately smallest in Northumberland, largest in Cumberland, and the East and North Ridings of Yorkshire. The Celtic material is in most places rather small, largest in Cumberland; it is everywhere present, however, in certain types of names. French names are still fewer; but the French influence upon the spelling of names that already existed is frequently seen.[1] The Roman influence is practically limited to the two name-themes *-caster* and *-street* (Latin *castrum,* plur. *castra,* and *strata via*); but these were both borrowed in the beginning of the OE. period, and they are in reality to be considered as English elements in the place-names. The Celtic element, Old Irish, Kymric, and Gaelic (Goidelic of Scotland), in the order of importance (as it now seems to me), is seen often in river-names, and in farmstead and village names that derive from river-names. The English element is important in the names of parishes, hundreds, and the larger places, and it is everywhere extensively present in the names of smaller places. In the names of political divisions of counties, hundreds, etc. (organization names), the Scandinavian formations rival the English in some places.[2] Otherwise the Scandinavian names are most numerous in the names of farms and

[1] The Norman influence has been investigated by R. E. Zachrisson: *Anglo-Norman Influence on English Place-names.* Lund (Sweden, Dissertation), 1909. It is also dealt with somewhat in the various works on English place-names.

[2] This is shown by F. W. Moorman on pages xxii-xxiii of his book on *The Place-Names of the West Riding of Yorkshire,* 1910; also by Armitage Goodall in *The Place-Names of Southwest Yorkshire,* 1914, pp. 24-26.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

hamlets, and in minor names. There are numerous Anglo-Scandinavian hybrids; the racial mixture here was an intimate one. But Anglo-Celtic hybrids are proportionately rare. On the other hand, again, Celtic-Scandinavian hybrids are present in considerable number, particularly in northwestern England.[8] The Celtic component of these hybrids is most often Irish; perhaps we may conclude that the Norsemen of the northwestern counties came mostly from the Norse settlements in Ireland.

I shall now pass to a consideration of the elements that enter into the names, and a classification of the substantival themes.

§ 2. Forms of English place-names. Like the great body of English names, the names of places consist for the most part of either one word, as *Hill, Brooks,* or of two component parts, as e. g., *Farnham.* Names of three or more parts often occur among place-names, but they are nearly all relatively recent, and may for the purposes of this paper be disregarded. The modern forms of English names may, however, be etymologically very deceptive; a large part of them have undergone reductions and contractions of various kinds, in ways entirely different from the changes names have undergone among the Germanic peoples on the continent. But there have also sometimes taken place lengthenings of names, so that apparent two-theme names now and then turn out upon investigation to be names of one theme originally. An example of this is the West Yorkshire and Cumberland name *Barugh,* which comes from OE. *beorg,* 'hill,' 'mound.' Much more often, however, present monosyllabic names, such as appear, therefore, to be of one theme, represent reductions of an original double-theme name, as *Dent,* also a West Yorkshire name, which comes from OE. *denu,* 'valley,' + *hæð,* 'heath.' In the name *Windle,* Prescot Parish, West Derby, Lancashire, we have a slightly different kind of reduction, the source being OE. *wind* + *hyll,* 'windhill,' 'windy hill.'

In English the term 'place-name' is often used in the special sense of an 'inhabited place,' as farmstead, hamlet, or village. But such a limitation of the term is open to many objections; especially has it been unfortunate in English place-name study. A very large number of the farmsteads and dwellingsteads of England

[8] Most material in *Scandinavians and Celts in the Northwest of England.* By Eilert Ekwall. Lund, 1918.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

were originally merely 'enclosures,' or 'clearings,' and it becomes evident that this class of names must be considered along with any study of the names of the dwelling-places. Also a great many other names of dwelling-places are in their origin names of some landmark or natural feature; here we have, then, still another class that must be taken into account at almost every turn. It seems best, therefore, to use the term 'place-name' in the wider meaning that Scandinavian investigators employ the corresponding compound *stedsnavn,* and to classify into 1, '*habitation-names*' (farmsteads, manors, dwellings, hamlets, villages, fortresses); 2, '*culture-names*' (enclosures, fields, meadows, grazing-lands, roads, bridges, fishing-places, landing-places, etc.); 3, '*nature names*' (hills, mountains, forests, groves, streams, springs, valleys, ravines, bays, lakes, etc.).[4] Of the three, those of habitations are in general latest in point of time. But I have, here, listed this group first, because it is the class of names with which the study of place-names usually begins, and, so far as English studies are concerned, the material, now available is practically limited to these names. And it seems best to put 'culture' names in second place; the connection between these and the habitation names is very close; it is indeed sometimes impossible to separate them. The English names in *-ton,* OE. *tūn* (possibly sometimes ON. *tún*), is perhaps most often a culture-name, but it may also sometimes have been given at once to some home with an enclosure around it.

The third group, nature-names, forms a very large class, no doubt by far the largest of the three. For in the early days nearly every sort of a natural feature, that had something striking about it, differentiated itself in some way from its environment, received a name; and retains this name today, usually at any rate. Of course the fjords, the bays, and sounds, the bights, the streams, brooks, and waterfalls, will have names; but so will pools, and tarns, and 'waters,' creeks, and springs, and perhaps some marsh or bog, and rocky ledge, or crag, or ridge. So will islands, holms,

[4] This classification is also that of G. Indrebø, *Stadnammi i ei Fjellbygd,* Christiania, 1921. Moorman divides into 'landmark-names,' 'field-names,' and 'occupation-names.' Various other terms and groupings are used. I urge the adoption of the three names above given in English; to these could be added a 4th, 'organization-names' (political divisions, governmental terms).

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

skerries, promontories, points, slopes, hill-sides, ravines, ditches, hollows, 'bottoms,' valleys, flats, and numerous other places, as markers of location or for other reasons. It is naturally to groups 1 and 2 that the chief historical interest attaches. But the names in the third group will, perhaps, give us a more intimate picture of the life of the community. The linguistic importance of the material will be about the same kind for all three.

For our purpose the interest in place-names centers mainly in the second or final theme; in the following pages our consideration of them will be limited to this phase. It may be noted at this place that to a considerable extent the themes of the second component part also appear as themes of the first part. But ordinarily that will not be the case.[5] There will be a different body of themes, and particularly the first theme will very often be a proper name. According as the first or adjectival theme is a personal name or a local-descriptive term, the place-names may also be divided into personal place-names and topographic place-names. As indicated above we shall here consider only the final themes.

§ 3. Classification according to the final themes. The great majority of the place-names of northern England show Anglian or Scandinavian final themes. Of other national elements I shall speak below. It may be noted here that the question of Norse or Danish nationality is a difficult one in some groups of the names. Also the study of the names is complicated still further by the identity or great similarity of Anglian and Norse basic words in many cases.

I shall give the list of the themes appearing under each of the three kinds of names, listing the English, Scandinavian, Celtic, Roman, and French elements separately. The Anglian and Scandinavian themes will be given in their OE. and ON. forms. The corresponding modern suffix in its various forms will then be added. Translation of the OE. or ON. word has not been deemed necessary always.

I. Habitation Names:

English themes: OE. ÆRN, 'house' (*-ern, -horn*); BURH (*-borough, -bury*); BŌÐL, BŌTL, 'house,' 'dwelling' (*-bold*); COT,

[5] For 'first' and 'second' theme, also 'adjectival' and 'substantival' are used.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

n., COTE, f., (*-cot, -coat, -coats*); GEAT, GÆT (*-yate*); HAGA, 'enclosure,' 'homestead' (*-haw, -haigh, -hey*); HALL, (*-hall, -all*); HAM, 'village,' 'dwelling' (*-ham, -am*); HŪS (*-house, -houses*); CIRICE (*-church*); ME. SET, 'shieling,' 'pasture,' cf. OE. *set*, 'fold' (*-set, -side*); SETL, 'dwelling' (*-seattle*); ÞORP, (*-thorp*); TŪN (*-ton*); WĪC, 'dwelling-place,' 'village' (*-wick, -wich*); WORÐ, WEORÐ, WYRÐ, 'enclosure,' 'farm,' 'homestead' (*-worth*).

Scandinavian themes: ON. BÚÐ, OD. BŌÞ, 'booth,' (*-booth, -booths*); BÓLSTAÐR, 'dwelling-place' (*-bolster, -boustead*); BÚR, (*-bower*); BYGGING < vb. *byggia*, 'to build' (*-biggin, -biggins*);[6] BŒR, BÝR, 'dwelling-place,' 'village', OD. BY, 'village,' 'town' (*-by*); GARÐR, 'enclosure,' 'yard,' 'dwelling,' (*-garth, -gard.* See below); KOT, 'hut' (*-cot, -coats*); HÚS, (*-house, -houses*); KYRKIA, (*-kirk*); RANN, 'house' (*-ran, -ren*); SÆTR, 'sæter,' 'dairy,' 'hut' (possibly only as first element); SETR, 'seat,' 'dwelling-place' (*-set, -side*); SKÁLI, 'shed,' 'hut' (*-scale, -scales, -schole, -skil, -skel*); STAÐR, 'place,' pl., *staðir*, often in Norwegian place-names (*-ster, -stead, -steth, -stead, -steads*); TOFT, TOPT, 'grassy knoll' (*-toft*); ÞORP, 'group of homesteads,' 'village,' 'croft' (*-thorp, -thorpe, -trop.*).

Latin theme: CASTRUM, plural *castra*, 'camp,' borrowed in OE. in the form *ceaster* (and *cæster*), and in this form enters place-names; is really, therefore, to be listed with English place-names formations. In southern England the word remains in the form *-cester*, and *-chester*. In northern England the OE. form *-ceaster* was Scandinavianized to *-caster*.

II. Culture Names:

English themes: OE. ÆCER (*-acre, -acres, -aker, -icar*); BRYCG, (*-bridge*); BYRE, 'cow-house' (*-byr*); CROFT, 'enclosed field or pasture,' 'piece of arable land near a house' (*-croft*); EDISC, 'pasture' (*-dish*); ERÐ, 'plowed land' (*-arth, -erd*); HAMM, 'meadow,' 'enclosure,' (*-ham, -am*). See HAM above; ĒG, 'island,' 'meadow near a river or other body of water' (*-ea, -ay, -ey*); FALD, 'stable,' 'cattle pen' (*-fold*); FELD, 'field' (*-field*); FALL,

[6] The word *biggin*, either as final theme or otherwise as part of place-names, does not necessarily, however, indicate a Scandinavian settlement: it is doubtful if it ever does in Northumberland, for example.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

(*-fall, -fal,* the meaning of which is sometimes 'forest-clearing'); FORD, (*-ford,* now and then *-forth*); FURLONG, 'a division of an unenclosed field' (*-furlong*); GEAT, GÆT, (*-yate*); ME. GRENE, 'a common' (*-green, -greens, Green*); HAGA, see I, (*-haw, -haigh, -hey*); HÆGE, HEGE, (*-hey, -ey*); GRUND, (*-ground, Ground*); HALH, 'meadow by a river' (*-haw, -algh, -al*); HLOT, 'lot,' 'allotment' (*-lot, -let*); HRYDING, 'a piece of cleared land' (*-riding*); LAND, (*-land, -lands*); LANU, 'lane,' (*-land, -lane*); LĒAH, 'field,' 'meadow' (*-ley*); LOC, LOCA, 'enclosure,' (*-lock, -lick*); MÆD, MED, (*-met*); RĀW, 'row,' 'row of houses' (*-ray, -rah, -raw*); ROD, 'clearing' (*-rod, -rode*); STOC, 'stump,' (*-stock, -stoke, -stocks*); STEDE, STYDE, 'place' (*-sted, -stead*); TŪN (*-ton*); STALL, 'place,' 'stall for cattle'; WEG, (*-way*).

Scandinavian themes: ON. AKR (*-acre,* etc.; see above); BRYGGJA, 'bridge,' (*-brig*); EIÐ, 'neck of land,' (*-aith*); ENG, 'meadow' (*-ing*); EY, 'island,' see also above (*-ea, -ay, -ey*); FALL (see above); FLǪT, 'level piece of land' (*-flat, -falt*); GARÐR, 'enclosed ground,' 'enclosed ground and houses' (*-garth, -gard, -gards, guards*); GATA, 'road' (*-gate, -gait*); GRUND, 'ground,' 'soil,' 'field' (*-ground, Ground*); HAUGR, 'hill,' 'mound,' 'cairn' (*-haw, -how, -ho, -o, -oe, -all, -haws*); HLAÐA, 'barn' (*-laith, -lathe*); HREYSI, 'cairn' (*-rays*); LOG, (*-law, -lawe*); RUÐ, 'clearing' (*-rud*); RÁ, 'boundery line' (*-ray*); RUM, 'place, seat, room' (*-rum, rem*); *SNAP, Ice. '*snap,*' 'scanty grazing,' ME. *snape,* 'pasture' (*-snape, -snope*); SKEIÐ, 'a run,' 'way between two fields,' 'race-course' (*-skayth, -sket*); STÍGR, 'path,' (*-sty*); STǪNG, 'pole,' (*-stang*); ÞING, (*-then, Thing*); TÚN, 'enclosure' (see above); ÞVEIT, 'meadow,' Norw. *tveit,* 'a place of meadow-land,' 'a clearing,' (*-thwaite*); *vað,* 'ford,' (*-wath*); VARÐI, 'a heap of stones, 'cairn,' (*-warth, -worth*); VRÁ, RÁ, 'nook,' 'secluded spot,' (*-wray, -ray*); VǪLLR, 'meadow,' 'grazing ground,'- (*-wall*).

Celtic themes: OIr. *cross,* OE. *cross,* ON. *kross* (Lat. *crux, crucem*). Goodall has pointed out that 'the yoke-fellow of cross is invariably a word of Scandinavian origin,'[7] in the names in northern England, and with Goodall, Ekwall holds that the English 'cross' was probably derived chiefly from Scandinavian *kross*;[8] OIr. AIRGE ,'a herd of cattle,' 'a dairy,' ON. *erg,* 'a sum-

[7] *L. c.*, p. 29.

[8] *The Place-Names of Lancashire.* By E. Ekwall. Manchester, 1922, p.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

mer farm, 'a shieling,' ME. *ergh, argh,* 'pasture,' 'hut on a pasture,' 'shieling' (*-argh, -ark, -ergh, -er*). The ME. word is probably chiefly derived from the ON. *erg.* The place-names in question are, however, sometimes, it would seem, directly of Irish (or Gaelic) origin.

Norman-French themes: OFr. CLOS, ME. *clos,* 'enclosure,' (*-close, Close*); OFr. LANDE, 'glade,' 'pasture,' (*-Laund*); [9] OFr. PARC, ME. 'parc,' 'park,' 'parrock,' 'field.' (*-Park*).

Latin themes: OE. PORT, (< Lat. *portus*), (*-port*); OE. STRǢT, STRĒT, (*-street*). See § 1 above.

III. NATURE NAMES:

English themes: OE. ĀC, (*-oak, -ock, -og*); ALOR, 'alder,' (*-oller, -ollers*); BEARO, 'grove,' (*-barrow*); *beorh,* (*-borough, -barrow, -bury,*[10] *-ber, -burth*); BOÞM, BOTM, 'bottom,' ME. *bothem,* 'bottom,' 'dell,' (*-bottom*); BROC, (*-brook*); BRU, (*-Brow*); BURNA, BURNE, (*-burne, -borne*); BYHT, 'bend,' (*-beet*); CLIF, (*-cliffe, -cliff*); CLOH, 'ravine,' (*-clough*); CNOTTA, 'knot,' cf. ME. *knot,* 'hill,' (*-Knot*); COPP, 'summit,' (*-kup, -Copp*); COT, COTE, (*-cot, -cote, -coats, -coat*); DÆL. (*dale*); DENU, 'a plain,' 'a vale,' (*-den, -don, -dean*); DĪC, (*-dyke, -dish*); *dūn,* 'elevated land' (OIr. *dún,* 'hill,' 'fortified hill,' 'fort'), (*-down, -don, -ton*); ĒA, (*-ey*); ECG, (*-edge, -idge, -age*); EFES, 'edge of a wood' (*-eaves, -eves*); *ēg,* (*-ey, -ay, -ea, -y*); FEARN, 'fern,' (*-fern*); FYRHÐ, 'wooded region,' 'frith,' (*-frith*); FLĒOT, 'bay,' 'estuary,' (*-fleet*); FLĒOTE, 'current,' 'stream,' (*-fleet*); GRÆF, 'ditch,' (*-grave*); *grāf, græfa,* 'thicket,' 'grove,' (*-greave, -greaves. -Greaves*); HALH, 'corner,' 'low-lying ground by a river,' (*-halgh, -all, -al, -haw*); HEAFOD, (*-head, -ide*); HLIÐ, 'slope,' (*-let, -leth, -ley*); HŌH, 'heel,' 'ridge of land,' (*-o, -ah, -gha*); HOL, HOLH, 'hole,' 'hollow,' (*-hole, -holes, -all, -ol*); HOP, (*-hope, -op, -up*); HRYCG, (*-ridge, -rigg, -rake*); HYLL, (*-hill, -il, -ull, -ell, -le*); HYRST, (*-hurst*); LACU, (*-lake, -lock*); LAND, (*-land*); MERE,

9. This work appears in *Remains Historical and Literary Connected with the Palatine Counties of Lancaster and Chester,* and also in *The Manchester University Press.*

[9] A capital in such cases indicates that the name is not written as a compound.

[10] *-bury,* here, may be doubtful; possibly always goes back to *byrig,* dative case of *burh.* See above.

Digitized by Google

Original from
UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

(*-mere*); MERSC, (*-marsh*); *mōr*, (*-moor, -Moor, -Moors*); MOS, (*-moss, -Moss*); NÆSS, (*-ness*); ŌFER, 'edge,' 'bank,' (*-over*); PŌL, (*-pool*); SAND, (*-sand*); SCAGA, SCEAGA, (*-shaw*); SĪC, 'streamlet,' (*-such, -sike, -syke*); SIDE, (*-side*); SLAED, 'forest' 'glade,' 'valley,' (*-slate, -Slade*); STALL, 'pool,' (*-stall, -stale*); STĀN, (*-stone, -ston*); SPRING, (*-spring*); SCILFE, SCYLFE, 'ledge,' (*-shelf, -shall*); TRĒOW, (*-tree*); TWISLA, 'fork of a river' (*-twistle*); ÞORN, (*-thorne, -thorn, -Thorns*); WÆL, 'deep pool,' 'gulf,' (*-weel, -Wheel*); WÆLLA, WELL, WIELL, (*-well*); WÆTER, (*-water, -Water*); WUDU, (*-wood, -Wood*).

Scandinavian themes: ON. Á, 'river,' 'stream,' (*-a, -ay, -ey*); BAKKI, *BANKI, (*-bank, -Bank, -banks*); BEKKR, 'brook,' (*-beck*); BERG, (*-bergh, -ber*, see also above); BOTN, 'bottom,' (*-Botton*); BREKKA, 'slope,' (*-breck, -brick, -Breck*); OSc. *BRINKA, ON. BREKKA, (*-brinks*, once); EY, 'island,' (*-ea, -ay, -ey*); DALR, (*-dale*); EYRR, 'gravel bank,' (*-Ayre*); FIALL, FELL, (*-fell, -field*); GEIL, 'ravine,' (*-Gaile*); GIL, do., (*-gil*); GREIN, 'branch,' (*-Grane*); HAUGR, 'hill,' (*-haw, -haws, -oe, -how, -hows*); HLÍÐ, 'slope,' (*-leth, -let, -lith, -ley*); HOLMR, HOLMI, (*-holme, -holmes, -holm, -Holmes*, also *-am.* and *-ham*); HǪFUÐ, (*-head, -eth*); HRYGGR, (*-rigg*); HYLR, 'pool,' (*-le, -al*); HVALL, 'knoll,' 'hillock,' (*-wha*(?) *-Whale*); KELDA, 'spring,' (*-keld*); KIARR, 'copse,' 'thicket,' (*-carr, -car, -ker*); KLEIF, 'hill-side,' (*-Claife, -kley*); LAND, (*-land, -lands*); LUNDR, 'grove,' (*-Lund, -land*); MELR, 'sand-hill,' (*-mel, -meles, -Meols*); MYNNI, 'mouth of a river,' (*-mine*); MYRR, (*-mire, -mer*); NABBR, NABBI, 'a peak,' (*-nab, -Nab*); ODDI, 'point,' 'cape,' (*-odd*); SKARÐ, 'cleft,' 'mountain pass,' (*-car, -ker*(?)); SKER, 'skerry' (*-ster, -Scaur, Scar*); SKÓGR, 'forest,' (*-scough, -scoe, -scow*); SKUTI, (*-scout*); SLAKKI, 'valley,' (*-slack, -Slack, -Slacks*); SLÉTTA, 'a plain,' 'level field,' (*-slet*, once *-celet*); STORÐ, 'brushwood,' (*-Storrs*); TIǪRN, (*-Tarn*); ÞORN, (as above); VÍK, 'bay,' (*-wick, -wyke*); VIÐR, 'woods,' (*-with*).

Celtic themes: OIr. and Gaelic CREAG, Welsh, *creag*, 'rock,' ME. *crag*, (*-crag, -Crag, -Craggs*); OE. CUMB, 'glen,' 'valley' = Welsh CWM, 'glen,' (*-combe*; but especially as first theme, as *Cumdivock* in Cumberland); OIr. DÚN (see above); Welsh, CHWYN, 'weeds,' possibly in *Cumwhinton*, as Sedgefield, p. 192;[11]

[11] *The Place-Names of Cumberland and Westmoreland.* By W. J. Sedgefield. Manchester University Press, 1915.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

RHUDDAWC, 'ruddy,' (in *Penruddock,* Cumberland). In names of Celtic origin the themes of the first position must be considered, as that is here the substantival (our secondary) theme. Other cases are: Welsh CAER-, 'fortified town,' in Cumberland, four times, (Sedgefield); Welsh CAREG, Gaelic, *carraig,* 'rock,' once; Gael. CNOC, 'hill,' once; Celt. PEN, 'mountain,' in *Penrith* and *Penruddock.*

It will be seen that many of the Anglian and Scandinavian themes are identical (*clif-klif; cot-kot; hūs-hús; land-land; mōr-mór; næss-nes; sand-sandr; sīc-sík; tūn-tún; þorp-þorp, wīc-vík*). To some extent a difference in meaning or the prevailing use of the word in Anglian and Scandinavian will point the way toward determining the source. But there are many cases where other tests must be applied, and there will be a residue of instances where absolute certainty will be impossible. There are furthermore other important words that are so nearly the same in OE. and ON. that they must soon have coincided in bilingual communities in the dialect and in the pronunciation of the names of places that contained these elements. (Such elements are: *æcer-akr; æsc-askr; beorh-berg; cnæp-knappr; dæl-dalr; ēg-ey; hliđ-hlíđ; hop-hōp; mos-mosi; pōl-pollr; stæf-stafr; stige-stígr*).[12] I shall here merely add that in general the ending *-ton* is regarded as Anglian, also in northern England, and that there also *-dæl* is Anglian, but that *-thorp* is Scandinavian. In southern England (as Gloucestershire) names in *-thorp* must be regarded as English. The ending *-wick,* southern English *-wich,* is usually English, the meaning being for the most part, 'dwelling-place,' 'hamlet,' as OE. *wīc*; the ON. *vík* meant, 'inlet,' 'bay,' and this appears now and then in names where the termination meant, 'bay' or 'creek,' and where the first theme is a Scandinavian word or proper name.[13]

The themes appearing are of very unequal importance in the body of place-names as a whole. Many appear only once or twice; it is possible that I have omitted some of these; and I have intentionally left out some because the suggested etymology seems to

[12] Some of these were identical in the stem of the oblique cases.

[13] A very good discussion of some of the main elements entering into the place-names may be found in Allan Mawer's *The Place-Names of Northumberland and Durham,* Cambridge, 1920.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

me not sufficiently supported. The commonest English themes are: *-ton, -ham, -borough, -ford, -hall* (*-all*), *-ley, -worth, -field, -hill, -set* (*-side*), *-ing,* and the ending *-dale.* The Scandinavian themes that are most often met with are: *-by, -thorp, -thwaite, -gill, -toft, -how* (*-haw*), and *-scale* (*-schole*); but *-dale, -ey,* and *-ness,* are no doubt often Scandinavian. It cannot always be decided whether the endings *-dūn* (*-don*), and *-cum* (*-combe*), is English or Celtic.

Our classification shows also that Angles and Scandinavians have participated rather unequally in the naming of the different classes of place-names. The earliest are the nature-names; here the Anglian element is represented by no fewer than 56 themes; the Scandinavian group numbers 45. We should expect the Celtic element to be larger here than in the other two groups; and it actually is so, though the absolute number of themes is very small. In the second group, Culture names, the English element is still the largest, so far as the number of different themes is concerned, there being 33. This group contains 30 Scandinavian themes. In class I, Habitation names, there are 13 English final themes; but here the Scandinavian factor is the largest, being represented by 17. In the actual number of names occurring, however, the English element dominates also in this class in most parts. In the total of all three classes a count of all names would show, perhaps, that the Scandinavian element dominates only in the East and North Ridings of Yorkshire and some parts of the Lake country, so far as northern England, north of the Humber and the Mersey, is concerned.

George T. Flom.

University of Illinois.

DIE NEUDRUCKE DEUTSCHER LITERATURWERKE [1]

Die Wissenschaft der deutschen Philologie wurde recht eigentlich erst begründet durch Jakob Grimms *Deutsche Grammatik,* deren erster Band im Jahre 1819 erschienen ist. In diesem Werke gab der Verfasser auch eine Darstellung der mittelhochdeutschen

[1] This paper was presented before the Germanistic Section at the recent meeting of the *MLA* at the University of Michigan.—Ed.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

und neuhochdeutschen Grammatik. Als Grundlage nahm er für das Mhd. die literarische Sprache des 13. Jahrhunderts, für das Nhd. die lebende Schriftsprache seiner Zeit, so dass unvermittelt zwei Sprachformen neben einander standen, die durch sechs Jahrhunderte getrennt waren. Das war ein Mangel, den Jakob Grimm selbst fühlte, der jedoch in zeitlichen und persönlichen Verhältnissen seine Erklärung fand. Das Studium der werdenden nhd. Schriftsprache, der Sprache des 16. and 17. Jahrhunderts, lag damals noch ganz im Argen. Aber auch in den folgenden Jahrzehnten wurde diesem Mangel zunächst nicht abgeholfen, da die Germanisten sich meist auf das Studium des Altdeutschen beschränkten und auch ferner das lebende Nhd. direkt aus dem Mhd. erklärten. Erst in den letzten Jahrzehnten des vorigen Jahrhunderts kam ein eindringendes Studium der frühneuhochdeutschen Sprache mehr in Aufnahme. Behindert war das zunächst dadurch, dass die Literaturdenkmäler des 17. und ganz besonders des 16. Jahrhunderts nur auf grösseren Bibliotheken in alten Originaldrucken vorlagen. Diesem Bedürfnis suchte ich entgegenzukommen durch die Begründung der Neudrucksammlung. Meine Sammlung wollte zugleich der Literaturkenntnis Dienste leisten, indem sie die wichtigsten Werke der beiden Jahrhunderte zu wohlfeilem Preise den weitesten Kreisen zugänglich machte. Aber für das Sprachstudium wurde sie besonders dadurch förderlich, dass sie die Texte in originaler Gestalt wiedergab, nicht sprachlich modernisiert, wie vorher so manche Ausgaben dieser älteren Literatur erschienen waren. Von 1876 bis 1914 wuchs die Sammlung auf 245 Nummern an. Nach Ausbruch des Krieges musste die Weiterführung ruhen und die Nachkriegsjahre brachten die immer steigende Verelendung Deutschlands, durch die eine Wiederaufnahme unmöglich gemacht wurde. Im laufenden Jahre ist allerdings noch ein weiteres Stück erschienen: Grimmelshausens *Courasche* (Nr. 246-48), dessen Manuskript sich aber schon im Jahre 1914 in des Herausgebers Händen befand. Damit dürfte wohl der Schluss der Sammlung gegeben sein, falls nicht günstigere Zeiten für uns wiederkehren.

Für die Sprache des 16. Jahrhunderts bietet uns die Sammlung ein reiches Quellenmaterial aus den verschiedenen Provinzen des deutschen Landes dar. Nachdem schon im 15. Jahrhundert die fürstlichen Kanzleien für die Einigung der deutschen Schreib-

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

sprache bedeutsame Vorarbeit geleistet hatten, tritt im 16. Jahrhundert der mehr und mehr überhandnehmende Buchdruck die Führung in der Ausbildung der Sprachform an. Anfangs war die deutsche Drucksprache noch nach Provinzen geschieden und erst im Laufe des 16. Jahrhunderts stellte sich allmählich eine grössere Ausgleichung ein. Diese Verhältnisse sind in den Hauptzügen dargelegt von Karl v. Bahder in seinem Buche: *Grundlagen des neuhochdeutschen Lautsystems, Beiträge zur Geschichte der deutschen Schriftsprache im 15. und 16. Jahrhundert. Strassburg 1890.* Fünf Drucksprachen unterscheidet v. Bahder für das 16. Jahrhundert: die bairisch-schwäbische mit Augsburg als Hauptdruckort, die alemannische mit Basel und Strassburg, die Nürnbergische, die westmitteldeutsche mit Mainz und Frankfurt, die ostmitteldeutsche mit Leipzig und Wittenberg. Als sechste Gruppe der im Druck vertretenen Provinzialsprachen ist diesen noch die mittelfränkische mit Köln als Hauptort beizufügen und besonders wichtig als siebente Gruppe das weite Gebiet der niederdeutschen Sprache, welches in der ersten Hälfte des Jahrhunderts noch in dieser seiner Muttersprache druckte, in der zweiten Hälfte aber zur hochdeutschen Drucksprache überging und zwar in der durch Martin Luthers Schriften in den Vordergrund gerückten ostmitteldeutschen Sprachform, welche erst durch das Hinzutreten Norddeutschlands ihren endgültigen Sieg über die übrigen Drucksprachen errang.

Die niederdeutsche Literatursprache der ersten Hälfte des Jahrhunderts ist in meiner Sammlung noch durch das Fastnachtspiel des Burkhard Waldis *der verlorene Sohn* von 1527 (Neudruck No. 30) vertreten, sowie durch die Prosaschrift von Bernhard Rotmann 1534 *Restitution rechter und gesunder christlicher Lehre* (No. 77-78), während z. B. die 1587 in Berlin erschienene Schwanksammlung Bartholomäus Krügers (No. 33) und manche andre in der Sammlung enthaltenen Stücke aus Niederdeutschland schon in ostmitteldeutscher Schriftsprache geschrieben sind, neben denen die in der Mitte des 17. Jahrhunderts erscheinenden niederdeutschen Scherzgedichte Johann Lauremberg's (No. 16-17) nur eine vereinzelte eigenwillige Ausnahme bilden.

Von den hochdeutschen Literatursprachen haben die südlichsten ihre Eigenart am längsten festgehalten: schwäbisch-bairisch ist der *Fortunatus,* Augsburg 1509 (No. 240-41); auch das Drama

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

Ferdinands II. *Speculum vitae humanae* (No. 79-80), welches 1584 in Innsbruck gedruckt ist, zeigt durchaus die oberdeutsche Färbung der Sprache. Der alemannische Stamm ist in seiner hochalemannischen Sprachform vertreten durch Zwingli's Reformationsschrift *Von Freiheit der Speisen* 1522 (No. 173) und Hans Rudolf Manuels *Weinspiel,* 1548 (No. 101-2); die niederalemannische Sprache von Strassburg ist aus den ersten Decennien des Jahrhunderts reichlich vertreten vor allem durch Thomas Murners Dichtungen *Schelmenzunft* (No. 83) *Narrenbeschwörung* (No. 119-124) und die Prosaschrift *An den Adel deutscher Nation* 1520 (No. 153). In Strassburg war schon zu Murners Zeit die Drucksprache durch die Gemeinsprache etwas beeinflusst; in der zweiten Hälfte des Jahrhunderts zeigen uns die Werke Johann Fischarts (No. 2. 5. 65-71. 182) eine Sprachform, in der die neuen Diphthonge durchgeführt sind und in allen Hauptsachen die Vorbilder der ostmitteldeutschen Schriftsprache herrschen. Die Form der ostmitteldeutschen Drucksprache ist nicht, wie man wohl früher meinte, erst von Luther geschaffen. Aber dass er diese Sprachform in seinen weitverbreiteten und tief wirkenden Schriften anwandte, das hat für ihr allmähliches Durchdringen doch die Entscheidung gegeben. Luthers Schriften sind in der Sammlung reich vertreten (No. 4. 18. 28. 50. 83-84. 93-94. 96-98. 103. 230). Das westmitteldeutsch-rheinfränkische schloss sich schon früh an: der Hesse Erasmus Alberus in seinen Fabeln (No. 104-7), der Wormser Kasper Scheidt mit seinem *Grobianus* (No. 34-35) können dafür als Beispiele dienen. Auch die Nürnbergische Drucksprache mündete bald nach Luthers Auftreten allmählich in die ostmitteldeutsche Weise ein. Sie nimmt durch Hans Sachs in der Sammlung einen bedeutenden Raum ein: die mehrbändigen Ausgaben seiner Fastnachtsspiele und seiner Fabeln und Schwänke bieten zugleich Anlass die Entwicklung der Nürnbergischen Schriftsprache zu beobachten. Die nach Hans Sachsens eigenen Handschriften abgedruckten Stücke geben noch mehr altnürnbergische Sprachform, während die Einzeldrucke und in erhöhtem Masse die aus der Folioausgabe der Gesammelten Werke (1558 ff.) entnommenen Stücke sich der allgemeinen Schriftsprache enger anschliessen.

Zeigt also das ganze 16. Jahrhundert in seinem Verlauf das Hinstreben nach dem Ideal der ostmitteldeutschen Drucksprache,

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

so bringt doch erst das 17. Jahrhundert die rechte Erfüllung. Das Auftreten von Martin Opitz und seinen Mitstrebenden und Nachfolgern, die schlesischen Dichterschulen, gewinnen einen solchen Einfluss auf die Sprachform von ganz Deutschland, dass nur die südlichen und katholischen Randgebiete noch gröbere Abweichungen sich gestatten. Besonders aber hält die politisch abgetrennte deutsche Schweiz an ihrer hochalemannischen Sprachform auch im Druckgebrauch noch länger fest. Aber auch sonst sind im ganzen 17. Jahrhundert feinere Unterschiede der Sprachform in den einzelnen Landschaften noch vorhanden. Die Schriftsteller dieser Zeit, deren Werke in unserer Sammlung vorliegen, bieten reichliches Material, um darüber genauere Untersuchungen anzustellen. Beispielsweise sei auf die Sprache Grimmelshausens hingewiesen, über die besonders der Herausgeber des jüngsten Neudrucks, J. H. Scholte, sehr förderlich gehandelt hat. In der Einleitung zur *Courasche* zeigt er, die Resultate seiner Arbeit zusammenfassend, wie eine Reihe von Ausgaben die originale Sprache Grimmelshausens bietet, während andere eine leise sprachliche Überarbeitung eines Nürnberger Correktors aufweisen, der die Sprache des Autors der schriftsprachlichen Norm angleicht. In der Ausgabe der *Courasche* sind originale Form und Überarbeitung in Text und Varianten nebeneinander zur Anschauung gebracht.

WILHELM BRAUNE.

Heidelberg.

THE SOURCES OF THE NINTH SONNET OF *LES REGRETS*

The well-known Ninth Sonnet of Du Bellay's *Regrets* begins:

> France, mere des arts, des armes & des loix,
> Tu m'as nourri long temps du laict de ta mamelle:
> Ores, comme un aigneau qui sa nourisse appelle,
> Je rempli de ton nom les antres & les bois.

Turning to the *édition critique* by H. Chamard, we find (II, 59)[1] that the comparison which the poet makes of himself to a lamb

[1] For a discussion, see J. Vianey, *Le Pétrarquisme en France*, pp. 339 ff.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

calling for its mother (*nourisse*) is apparently taken from a sonnet by Pamphilo Sasso, beginning:

> Come el timido agnel del gregge fore,

and that the ninth line of Sasso's sonnet supplies the basis for Du Bellay's fourth, which becomes quite clear only when we realize that it is a paraphrase of

> Per selve e piaggie, per valle e per monti
> Vado cridando.

This, however, is as far as the similarity goes; and the remainder of Du Bellay's sonnet, consisting of the second quatrain and the sestet, is Du Bellay's own felicitous development of this idea.

But what shall we say of the ringing first line, which seems so characteristic of the author of the *Deffence* and his use of the word *patrie*? [2] Surely this verse is his own, not only in form but in essence? And, in fact, no one appears thus far to have called in question its originality. In reading the Latin verse-epistles of Petrarch, however, I came across the following lines in Petrarch's well-known Hymn to Italy: [3]

> Armorum legumque eadem veneranda sacrarum
> Pyeridumque domus.

Obviously, the similarity to Du Bellay's line is striking. But is Du Bellay here necessarily the debtor? Does he not disclaim in the *Regrets* his usual habit of Petrarchizing? For Sonnet IV begins with the significant words:

> Je ne veulx fueilleter les exemplaires Grecs,
> Je ne veulx retracer les beaux traicts d'Horace,
> Et moins veulx-je imiter d'un Petrarque la grace,

and we have no reason to doubt that essentially he is speaking the truth: Petrarchizing in the sense of piling up Petrarchan themes and epithets is not to be found in the *Regrets*.

Moreover, this fact is to be noted: the term "mother of arts" (*mere des arts*) appears to be a Classical commonplace, as is indicated by Milton, *Par. Reg.*, IV, 240:

[2] See Chamard's edition of the *Deffence*, p. 32, and the recent comment of Thibaudet, *Nouvelle Revue française*, XXI (1923), 86-88.

[3] Conveniently consulted in G. Volpi, *Il Trecento*, p. 136.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

Athens, the eye of Greece, mother of arts,

and by Cicero, *Tusculanae Disputationes,* I, 26, 64:

Philosophia, omnium mater artium.

Still closer is a line, suggested to me by Professor Mustard,[4] from Claudian, *De Consulatu Stilichonis,* III, 136:

Armorum legumque parens.

Professor Mustard believes that this line was probably the source of Petrarch's

Armorum legumque . . . domus,

for Petrarch was acquainted with Claudian's works, and, while he here used *domus* instead of *parens,* the latter word occurs in the very last line of his Hymn.

But was Claudian also the source of Du Bellay? Such a conclusion seems to me improbable, for the following reasons: (1) Du Bellay was undoubtedly more familiar with the works of Petrarch than with those of Claudian, if indeed he knew the latter at all;[5] (2) like Petrarch, Du Bellay mentions the "arts" in addition to "arms" and "laws," as stated by Claudian. While Petrarch calls Italy the "home" of "arms, laws and arts," Du Bellay goes him one better by calling France the "mother" of "arts, arms and laws"—the difference in the order of the words (and probably in the phraseology—*arts* for *Pyeridum*) being explicable by the fact that Petrarch's line is a Latin hexameter and Du Bellay's a French alexandrine. Not only is it improbable that such a similarity is due to coincidence but the change from "home" to "mother" would indicate that Du Bellay[6] is directly challenging the claim of Petrarch; that is, France, not Italy, holds the preeminence; (3) Petrarch's Hymn, the twenty-fourth of the third

[4] Through the intermediary of Professor Lancaster, who also suggested the above references.

[5] Ronsard in the *Discours de la poésie héroïque* states that Claudian is rarely read; yet Ronsard himself borrowed from him; see de Nolhac, *Ronsard et l'humanisme,* p. 41. But there appears to be no reference to Claudian in Du Bellay.

[6] Note that Sasso has the verse: "Quasi chiamando la *matre* e il pastore"; see Chamard, *l. c.*

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

book of his Latin Epistles in Verse,[7] was composed under circumstances not unlike those which later inspired Du Bellay. In May, 1353, Petrarch was returning, after an absence of several years, to his native land, which he was never again to leave. From the summit of Mount Genèvre he saw at his feet the fertile plains of Italy. It is at this moment, when about to set foot on Italian soil, that he is stirred by the patriotic fervor he incorporated into his poem. Hence the paean of praise, beginning:

> Salve, chara Deo, tellus sanctissima, salve

and culminating in the lines we are discussing. Reversing Petrarch's journey (over a different route), a little more than two centuries later, Du Bellay, now broken in health and in spirit, may have felt less exultant than his more fortunate predecessor: Du Bellay's career was practically at an end, whereas Petrarch in 1353 was looking forward to a ripe and triumphant old age. Chronologically, Du Bellay's poem preceded the return home, whereas Petrarch's followed it. One thing, however, is certain: Petrarch's attachment to Italy was never stronger than Du Bellay's love of France. Thus, while the first line of Sonnet IX is not a literal translation from Petrarch, it can at least be regarded as a "reminiscence"—in the sense in which Vianey has used that term. It is credible that Du Bellay knew the Classical commonplace. It is incredible that he did not know Petrarch's Hymn; and Sonnet IX is, I believe, additional evidence of the fact, for here in simple but vibrant French he improves upon the sonorous Latin of his Italian predecessor. May we not assume that Du Bellay thought his sixteenth century readers, knowing Petrarch, would institute their comparisons between his own verse and Petrarch's? In that case, without ceasing to be Petrarchan, his verse would not be a Petrarchism. It expresses—better than any other verse of *Les Regrets*—the reaction against the Renaissance so characteristic of these sonnets.

WM. A. NITZE.

University of Chicago.

[7] See Diana Magrini, *Le Epistole Metriche di Francesco Petrarca*, 1907, p. 163.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

THE SOURCES OF HEYWOOD'S *IF YOU KNOW NOT ME, YOU KNOW NOBODY,* PART I

The source from which Thomas Heywood drew the incidents of Part I of his play *If You Know Not Me, You Know Nobody* has been variously and incorrectly assigned. Historians and critics from Langbaine down to Ward have named Camden, Speed, DuChesne and Stow. Schelling introduced a new element of confusion when he stated that "both plays (i. e. parts) appear to be founded on a pamphlet later published as *England's Elizabeth.*"[1] The latter is Heywood's duodecimo volume printed in 1631, more than twenty-five years after the composition of the play; no evidence of any kind has been produced for its earlier existence. Ward, in his chapter on Heywood in the *Cambridge History of English Literature,* perpetuated the confusion by referring to "the historical narrative *England's Elizabeth,* to be noticed in connection with the play based upon it,"[2] and later calling the play "a crude *ad captandum* treatment of Elizabeth's experiences before her accession, following its text-book, Heywood's own monograph, *England's Elizabeth.*"[3] Creizenach came nearest the truth when he named Holinshed.[4]

The ultimate source is the account of Elizabeth's tribulations during her sister's reign given in Foxe's *Acts and Monuments.* The main part of this story is to be found in the section entitled "The Miraculous Preservation of the Lady Elizabeth."[5] Holinshed embodied this account in his chronicle, carefully attributing the material to the 1583 edition of Foxe.[6] Which of the two books was Heywood using? The very first scene of the play offers evidence that he had gone to the *Acts and Monuments.* Before the entrance of Mary as queen, Sussex says:

[1] F. E. Schelling, *The English Chronicle Play,* New York, 1902, p. 235.

[2] *Camb. Hist.*, VI, 98.

[3] *Ibid.*, VI, 103-4.

[4] *Geschichte des neueren Dramas,* Halle, 1916, V, 350.

[5] *Acts and Monuments of John Foxe.* Fourth Ed. . . . Rev. by J. Pratt, London, n. d., 8 vols. Vol. VIII, pp. 600-625. This section reprinted in Arber's *English Garner,* vol. IV, and in A. F. Pollard's *Tudor Tracts* 1532-1588, London, 1903.

[6] Ellis's Reprint of 1807-8, IV, 121-35.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

The Suffolke men, my Lord, were to the Queen
The very stayres by which she did ascend:
Shees greatly bound unto them for their loves.[7]

After Mary's entrance there comes before her one Dodds, bearing a petition from the Suffolk men begging her to keep the promise made to them that they should be allowed liberty of religion. At the instigation of the Cardinal of Winchester Mary roughly rebukes the Suffolk men for presuming to dictate to her, and at Winchester's order Dodds is led away to punishment in the pillory. Now Holinshed merely states that the Suffolk men helped Mary in her need on condition of her promise, and though he says, "but how soone she forgot that promise, it shall shortlie after plainlie appeare,"[8] he has no more of the matter and does not mention the petition incident. Foxe, on the other hand, not in the account of Elizabeth's preservation cited above, but in a previous passage of his book, after describing the assistance of the Suffolk men and Mary's promise, continues: "In consideration whereof, it was, methinks, a heavy word that she answered to the Suffolk men, afterwards, who did make supplication to her grace to perform her promise: 'Forasmuch,' saith she, 'as you, being but members, desire to rule your head, you shall one day well perceive that members must obey their head, and not look to rule over the same.' And not only that, but also to cause the same terror unto others, a certain gentleman named Master Dobbe, dwelling about Wyndham side, for the same cause (that is, for advertising her by humble request of her promise) was punished, being three sundry times set on the pillory to be a gazing stock unto all men."[9]

In the play Dodds presents the petition and makes his request. The dialogue goes on:

Winch. May't please your highnes note the Commons' insolence:
They tie you to conditions and set limits to your liking.
Queen. They shall know
To whom their faithfull duties they doe owe:
Since they the limbs, the head would seeke to sway,
Before they governe, they shall learne t'obey.
See it severely ordered, Winchester.

---

[7] *Dramatic Works of T. Heywood,* Pearson, London, 1874, I, 194.
[8] *Chronicles,* III, 1069.
[9] *Acts and Monuments,* VI, 387.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

Winch. Away with him, it shall be throughly scand;
And you upon the pillory three dayes stand. *Exit* Dodds.[10]

This is the only incident in Foxe which Heywood could not have found in Holinshed. There are, on the other hand, some passages in the play for which he could have obtained no suggestion from Foxe, but drew from Holinshed. Among these are a few details of the marriage of Mary and Philip, the departure of Philip from England, and the concluding speeches of Elizabeth and the Lord Mayor of London. The most notable instance of indebtedness to Holinshed is the episode of the treacherous killing of an Englishman by a Spaniard, which concludes thus:

Phil. What place is this, my Lords?
Suss. Charing Cross, my liege.
Phil. Then by this cross where thou hast done this murder
Thou shalt be hang'd. So, lords, away with him.[11]

This episode is based upon a single sentence of Holinshed's: "The 26 of October, a Spaniard was hangd at Charing crosse for killing an Englishman, there was offered for his life by other strangers 500 crownes, but all that would not staie justice."[12]

The main source of the play is, then, Foxe's narrative, whether read in the original or in Holinshed, and this the play follows with great closeness, not only in incident, but often in phraseology. The only important changes are in the incident of the white coat soldiers, developed from Foxe's bare statement that "there were a hundred of northern soldiers in white coats, watching and warding about the garden all that night," and the discovery of Winchester's death warrant for Elizabeth, elaborated and transferred from Bridges, lieutenant of the Tower, to Gresham. The small amount of matter taken from Holinshed is treated rather more freely. The only matter that can not be traced directly to one source or the other is that contained in the dumb shows, the prayers of Elizabeth and Gage and the dreams of Elizabeth and Clarentia—both being pious additions of the dramatist—and the scene of the denouement, with the picturesque episode of the three messengers, Tame's rebuke to the celebrating peasants, and the formal instatement of the new queen.

ROBERT GRANT MARTIN.

Northwestern University.

---

[10] *Works,* I, 196. [11] *Ibid.,* I, 225. [12] *Chronicles,* IV, 64.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

KING AUN IN THE RÖK INSCRIPTION[1]

In my *Literary History of Hamlet* (I, 67 ff.) I have shown that the Eanmund of the *Beowulf* was not altogether lost to Scandian tradition, but is represented, in part, by king Aun of the *Ynglinga.* I have also made it clear that Aun goes back to two historical figures, viz., Aun I (great-grandfather) and Aun II (great-grandson), and that Aun II was the Scandian counterpart of Eanmund. By virtue of their identity in name and family, the two Auns were eventually identified in Swedish tradition, and consequently only one Aun appears in the *Ynglinga.* The position of this Aun in the Yngling genealogy is that appropriate to the historical Aun I. The career given him, however, properly belongs, in large part, to Aun II, as comparison with the Beowulfian account shows.

Two questions now arise. First, how far back can we trace the composite Aun? Secondly, does there exist a form of the Aun story more primitive than that recorded in the *Ynglinga?* These questions can be answered, I think, after an examination of the 9th cy. Rök inscription. The fullest account of this inscription is to be found in Brate, *Östergötlands Runinskrifter,* pp. 231 ff., where full bibliographical references are given. For a discussion of the passage in which we are particularly interested see also Pipping, in *Studier i nordisk Filologi,* III. 8. 14 ff., and Patzig, in the *Zeitschrift für deutsches Altertum,* LX, 29 f. The inscription is noted for its length and for its obscurity. The latter characteristic is due, in all probability, to deliberate intention on the part of the author, who wrote in riddles, or, more accurately, phrased his references in such a way that only the initiated would understand them. At any rate the modern reader has his difficulties, and any interpretation must be offered with all reserves.

Our passage reads as follows (after Brate, *op. cit.,* p. 253):

a V . . . . . . þatsakumona
VII rthuaRfurniualtumonurþifiaru
VII miRhraiþkutumauktu
VIII miRonubsakaR

[1] This paper is intended to supersede my very brief discussion in *Hamlet,* I, 152 f., a discussion based on an interpretation which I have since given up, as doing violence to the text.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

This I divide into words thus:

> **þat sakum onart, huaR furni i ualtum on urþi fiarum**
> **miR hraiþkutum auk tu miR on ub sakaR**

Here the introductory clause makes no difficulties, of course. I take *huaR* to be the equivalent of Icel. *hvárr* 'which of two' or *hverr* 'which of several.' See Noreen, *Altschwedische Grammatik,* p. 413 ff., and (for *R* = *rR*) Lindroth, in *Studier i nordisk Filologi,* II. 8. 7, note 2. *Forni* I take to mean 'Ancient, man of Antiquity.' Cf. Fritzner sv. *forn.* For *i ualtum* 'in unpropitious times' cf. Icel. *úöld* 'hard times.' The word *on* I take to represent an adj. **ánn* 'old,' for which see my *Hamlet,* I, 68 (with references). For *fiarum* 'with life-blood' cf. the *Beowulf,* l. 1152. I follow Brate (*op. cit.,* p. 236) in connecting the second *on* with Icel. *enn* 'besides.' Finally, *ub sakaR* 'on account of offences' is one of Bugge's readings. My translation follows:

> That say we second, which man of the past in days of ill fortune became old by (the sacrifice of) lives among the Hreiðgotar and died among them furthermore on account of offences (that he had committed against someone).

If we analyze this passage we see that it refers to a man who

1) flourished long before the 9th cy. (the date of the inscription)
2) had much adversity to endure
3) became old (in exile?) among the Hreiðgotar (Geats?)
4) lengthened his life by sacrificing (to the gods) other human beings
5) died among the Hreiðgotar (Geats?)
6) as a result of a feud of some sort.

Let us now compare Snorri's account of Aun (*Ynglinga,* cap. 25). According to this account, Aun was the father of Egill (the Beowulfian Ongenþeow), who, according to Heusler's reckoning, was born c. 450 A. D. Aun accordingly belongs to the early 5th cy. and could appropriately be referred to as Forni by a 9th cy. rune-master. Aun's career as king was, apparently, a long series of misfortunes: he was continually defeated in battle, and lived no less than 40 years in exile. These years of exile were spent among the West Gautar or Geats. They fall into two periods of 20 years each. As I have shown elsewhere (*Hamlet,* I, 226 f.),

Digitized by Google · Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

the periods are doublets, and originally there was only one exile. That this was a long one, in the primitive traditional (as distinguished from historical) account, is evident from the version of Snorri, where Aun is 100 years old when he finally returns from Gautland. In my *Hamlet* (I, 150 ff.) I have given reasons for believing that the Hreiðgotar were originally the Geats. If so, the Forni of the passage above, who became old among the Hreiðgotar, corresponds neatly enough to Snorri's Aun, who became old in exile among the Gautar.

We find further that Aun, like our Forni, lengthened his life through human sacrifice. In Snorri's account the first sacrifice took place at Uppsala, but between the two periods of exile. Since these periods were originally one, the position of the sacrifice in the narrative is significant. It seems improbable that Aun was thought to have gone into exile, returned, made sacrifice and then gone into exile again. It would be much simpler to represent the sacrifice of the son as having occurred during the exile, and in fact Snorri puts the sacrifice in the midst of a period which was originally one of unbroken exile. Now the Forni of our passage does his sacrificing among the Hreiðgotar. He is not said to be in exile, it is true, but on the other hand he is not represented as a Hreiðgoth. Rather, the implication is that he lived away from home; the "miR" implies that Forni was with the Hreiðgotar but not of them. Exile is the natural explanation of this state of things, and there is nothing in the passage contradictory to such an explanation. Be it noted, too, that in both Snorri and the inscription more than one life is sacrificed.

The death of Forni corresponds to nothing in the *Ynglinga.* We do find, however, an exact correspondence to the events as narrated in the *Beowulf,* where Eanmund, after having been driven into exile by Onela, finally died at the hands of Onela's retainer, Weohstan the Geat. And his death took place, not at home, but in Geatland, his place of exile. Obviously the version given in our passage is here more primitive than that recorded in the *Ynglinga.* —It is interesting to note that the very prejudice against Eanmund so marked in the *Beowulf* reappears both in the inscription and in the *Ynglinga.* The *ub sakaR* of our passage puts Forni almost as definitely in the wrong as the *forhealden* of the *Beowulf* (l. 2381) damns Eanmund, while Snorri's Aun is a weak, unwarlike king

Digitized by Google | Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

deserving only contempt and detestation. One may conclude that the Aun story got its tone, at least, from Geatish rather than from Swedish sources.

What, then, was the development of the story? The identification of great-grandfather and great-grandson produced a composite figure of truly prodigious longevity, and this longevity became the determining factor in the growth of the tale. To account for it, a beginning was made by greatly lengthening the period of exile among the Geats. But since this did not suffice, the sacrifice theme arose. At first the sacrifices were connected with the period of exile, the only eventful period of Eanmund's life (and naturally the great-grandson, being closer at hand, furnished the bulk, if not all, of the historical material). But as time went on, Aun's great age came to dominate the story more and more, until his violent end was crowded out, inconsistent as it was with the conception of him as a person who had attained extreme old age. Furthermore, the scene of action was transferred to Uppsala—a very old man's proper place is clearly at home, not abroad. The exile story thus lost ground continually, and in the *Ynglinga* lingers as a survival, no longer in harmony with the tale in its developed form.

KEMP MALONE.

University of Minnesota.

A NEW POEM BY THOMAS CHATTERTON

Among the treasures bequeathed to the Library of Columbia University by Stephen Whitney Phoenix,[1] is a small oblong vellum-bound notebook, in which Thomas Chatterton wrote several poems in the autumn of 1769. The parchment cover bears Chatterton's name and several rude heraldic drawings similar to those on the "Rowley" documents. Of the original twenty leaves three have been cut out, and on the stubs nothing is legible save in one place "To Dr. . . . ." The remaining seventeen leaves contain several poems which Southey published from transcripts supplied by T. Hill, Esq., who owned the book in 1803, and in addition one unfinished and hitherto unpublished poem, which, by the kind per-

[1] The Phoenix Collection contains over 5,000 volumes mainly devoted to travel and literature, and including some autograph MSS.

Digitized by Google — Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

mission of the Library authorities, I now give in full, with Chatterton's characteristic epigram of comment. The subject of the elegy was probably Chatterton's teacher, T. Philips, but the poet later revised the first three lines for use in his *Elegy on Mr. William Smith.*[2] The new poem reads as follows:

ELEGY OCT 29.

Muse ascend on Sorrows sable Plume
Soar like the heavn ascending Wing
Of the great Bard you sing
With twisted Wreath of silverd Yew
Deck the laureld Poets Tomb,
The bard whose total Soul was God.

[Sickness prevents the grateful Lay
I End unknowing what to say
To speak his worth; my feeble Lyre
Cannot to such a Pitch aspire.]

A careful examination of the MS. reveals many errors in the versions Southey printed of the other poems (vol. I, 203-223) and a study of the texts of the Riverside edition, Boston 1855, the Aldine, London 1890, and Roberts, London 1906, convinces me that all later versions base their text of these poems on Southey, and that all changes are misprints or conjectures. I record Southey's verbal errors, giving his readings in italics, and those of the MS. in parentheses. Chatterton made few changes, when he did change, he usually erased a faulty word with a pen-knife and wrote over the space. Where the earlier reading is in any way legible, I record it, like the errors.

I. The poem beginning "Interest, thou universal god of men" —at the head Chatterton writes the date "27 Oct[ober 1769]." Southey's title *Fragment* is unhappy for the poem is complete.

ERRORS. L. 4 *Jails*(Jayl); l. 7 *us*(me); l. 24 *Chapman*(Chapmen); l. 28 (Friendship with equals only can be made); l. 22 *traffic*(traffic &).
CHANGES. L. 10 bed [First reading illegible, second reading,] (girl); l. 34 *Turtle*([sheri]ffs).

II. *Elegy written at Stanton Drew*—dated in MS. "27 [October]."

[2] Southey, i, 355.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

Errors. L. 3 *Fool*(foot); l. 32 *Coppice-valley*(Coppic'd valley); l. 38 *Thee*(thine).
Changes. L. 26 *When*(As).

III. The poem beginning "Far from the reach of critics and reviews" has no title in the ms., but is dated "27 Oct." Lines 47-50 form an epigram of comment which should be regarded as a kind of footnote, and before l. 51 is a second date, "28 Oct." There is no reason to call the poem a *Fragment;* it is complete.

Errors. L. 33 *Maro*(Maro's); l. 41 *medicine*(medicines); l. 59 *G–d*(God).
Changes. L. 41 *Anti* was inserted later, *medicines*(medicines lying); l. 70 *five*(four); l. 84 *Hair*(Air).

IV. *Elegy on T. Phillips.* There are two versions of this poem, that in the Columbia ms. being an early draft, as is proved by the dates annexed by Chatterton,[3] and by a study of the variants. Editors should print from the other copy, or like Southey and Roberts, give both versions. Although printed as one poem, the composition falls into three distinct parts.

(a.) Three heroic couplets at the beginning, an invocation to the muse without title. There are neither errors nor changes.

(b.) The elegy proper, called in the ms. simply *Elegy,* and dated "28 [October]." This version consists of 33 quatrains, of which Chatterton has marked with a cross for deletion the following stanzas, in some cases adding his reasons, which I give—vii "Expunged as unconnected"; xv "Too plain" (?); xxvi "Expunged as too flowery for grief"; xxxii; xxxiii. Beside xiv, 3-4 he wrote "alter."

Errors. vii, 3 *vallies*(Valley); xxiii, 1 *in*(at); in xxvi, 4 Chatterton wrote "darkned," in xxvii, 4 "negromantic."
Changes. i, 4 *string*(ring); iv, 4 *tempest*(Winter); xxiii, 2 *Ill*(Ills); xxv, 1 *Here*(Here . . .); xxxii, 4 *Comfort*(Comforts).

(c.) An epigram of comment badly misprinted hitherto, which reads as follows and is *not* signed "T. C."

---

[3] Southey, i, 22, and Roberts, i, 189; the latter gives the date December 5th to the other ms. This elegy is one of the best of Chatterton's modern poems and I cannot but think that some of the stanzas have influenced the *Ode to Autumn* of John Keats.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

To the Reader.

Observe in favor to an hobbling strain
Neat as Exported from the Parent brain
Are each & evry Couplet I have pend:
But little labord & I never mend.

V. Then follows the new poem given at the beginning of this article,—it shows no changes but the poet has drawn his pen across it, as a mark of cancellation.

VI. The poem beginning "Hervenis, harping on the hackneyed text" is headed in the ms. "Sunday 29" which seems less a title than a date, for October 29, 1769, fell on Sunday. That the poem is complete, and not a *Fragment* is shown by the ink stains on the last page of ms. from the contemporary drawings on the back cover of the notebook.

Errors. L. 16 *in*(a); l. 39 *There*(Here); l. 50 *Corset's*(Corslets). In l. 31 the word *their* is probably correct though not very clear. In l. 49 *bel* is quite distinct in the ms., nor do I agree with one editor who says it makes nonsense, but believe Chatterton meant "bell" as an architectural term.

Changes. L. 31 their(the).

Thomas Ollive Mabbott.

Columbia University.

REVIEWS

Ferdinand Brunot, *La Pensée et la Langue, Méthode, principes et plan d'une théorie nouvelle du langage appliquée au français,* Paris, Masson et Cie, 1922, xxxvi + 954 pages in 8°.

Il y a une belle virilité dans l'Introduction du Doyen de la Faculté des lettres de l'Université de Paris au volume de plus de 900 pages qu'il consacre à un plan de réforme dans l'enseignement de la langue. Il est piquant de voir ce grand pontife à Paris s'élever contre la "bureaucratie universitaire" et l'inertie gouvernementale et les timidités de divers conseils. "Mais quand il eût fallu imposer, elle [l'université] tolérait. Elle acceptait une amélioration comme on pardonne une faute. Un moment on a pu espérer que l'État allait trancher dans le vif, que l'orthographe, fléau de l'éducation grammaticale, allait être réformée. Sur ce point essentiel pourtant, la peur de l'opposition, et des coalitions

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

d'intérêts matériels, ont eù vite raison des vœux répétés du Conseil Supérieur. A cela il n'y a malheureusement nul remède; la carence des pouvoirs à qui a été remis le soin de régler périodiquement l'orthographe crée une situation sans issue. C'est le péché originel. Tant qu'on n'aura pas abjuré, tant que l'orthographe restera ce qu'elle est, aussi longtemps que le préjugé public attribuera une valeur de premier ordre à la connaissance de pures conventions d'écriture, l'enseignement véritable de la langue en souffrira; il restera gêné, étouffé, faussé, au moins dans les classes élémentaires. Les arbres empêchent de voir la forêt . . ." (VIII).

"La syntaxe est pire encore. Si épineuse que l'aient faite les raffineurs, son défaut principal est moins dans les subtilités exagérées que dans les erreurs positives" (IX). Voulez-vous un exemple; voyez la *Revue pédagogique* de sept. 1921. Un professeur, parlant d'article, déclare "que l'article défini s'emploie devant un objet nettement défini, nettement déterminé, l'article indéfini devant un objet quelconque, et que l'article partitif marque que l'on prend une partie d'un tout. Et cependant on dit sans aucune détermination; '*L'*homme est mortel,' et avec détermination, '*Un* homme s'est présenté chez vous.' On dit 'J'ai mangé *de la* soupe ce matin,' même si on a mangé toute la soupe de la soupière. Mais il reste entendu que *du, de la, des* sont des articles partitifs lorsqu'ils amènent un complément d'objet et *des* un article défini, même si le bons sens et la réfléxion y trouvent à redire" (X).

Pour aller tout de suite au coeur de la question, la cause du mal dont souffre notre enseignement est avant tout, selon M. Brunot, dans notre servitude vis-à-vis des Parties du discours. D'abord, on n'a jamais pu s'entendre sur leur nombre (XIV); et puis l'idée même en est fausse. Qu'on étudie par exemple le Conditionnel, dans le chapitre Verbe, et "toute une série d'expressions des conditions reste en dehors du chapitre" (XIV). Ou, prenez le chapitre des Degrés des adjectifs: "Pourquoi des adjectifs? Les adverbes n'ont-ils pas de degrés? *Plus souvent*, dirait Gavroche. Et les noms, et les caractéristiques de toute nature: *plus nature, plus comme il faut, plus homme de bien?* En outre pourquoi trois degrés? Parce qu'il y avait trois formes en latin et en grec, comme encore en allemand? Que nous importe? . . . On trouvera dans ce livre la série des moyens d'enchérir sur une appréciation.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

Il n'y en a pas moins de treize. Est-ce enseigner la langue que de les passer sous silence, à l'exception de deux ou trois?" (XVII).

Ce qu'il faut?—c'est, écrit M. Brunot, en caractères gras: "des méthodes où les faits ne soient plus rangés d'après l'ordre des signes, mais d'après l'ordre des idées" (XX). "Entre les formes les plus diverses de l'expression, entre les signes les plus disparates, il y a un lien, c'est l'idée commune que ces signes contribuent à exprimer. Si on la prend pour centre, il ne s'agit plus de choisir entre des rattachements abusifs ou des omissions forcées, tout s'ordonne autour d'elle; elle groupe des éléments linguistiques venus de toutes parts, et dont d'autres chapitres se trouvent allégés. Tout se complète, s'organise, se classe. De la sorte, *quelques hommes* cesse d'être aux indéfinis, pendant que *des hommes* est à l'article, *une poignée d'hommes* au nom, *vingt hommes* aux noms de nombre; les expressions de quantité précises ou imprécises se cataloguent dans le langage, comme le font ailleurs les nombres et les mesures" (XVIII).

Que trouverons-nous dans le volume de M. Brunot? Au lieu de chapitres partant des notions de substantif, adjectif, adverbe, verbe, conjonction, etc. nous aurons des chapitres traitant des *idées* de condition, d'action présente, d'appartenance, de causalité, de fin, de circonstance, etc., etc.

Voici, par exemple, Livre IV *Indétermination et détermination;* chap. I, *La notion de détermination;* . . . chap. II, *Les indéterminés.* Nous résumons le chapitre en citant les phrases qui indiquent le contenu: § 1. ". . . Il y a des nominaux indéterminés par nature: l'un d'entre eux est *on* dont nous reparlerons au *Sujet du verbe* (Livre VII, chap. XV). Rappelons aussi: *Quelqu'un*... *Quelquechose* . . . *Qui que ce soit, quoi que ce soit* . . . *Un tel* . . . *Tel* . . . *Quiconque,* qui est à proprement parler un conjonctif indéfini, mais tend à devenir un simple synonyme de *qui que ce soit* . . . [Il y a des exemples de phrases sous chacun de ces mots]. § 2. Moyens d'indéterminer les noms:—Ils ne sont pas très nombreux. 1. On emploie des adjectifs devant ou après le nom commun ou propre: 'Certain renard gascon . . .' *Un* à lui seul suffit à indéterminer les noms propres: 'un Monsieur Myrtil.' On emploie aussi et surtout *quelconque* qui suit toujours le nom. C'est le mot indéterminant par excellence, 'Un inspecteur quel-

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

conque' . . . *Tout,* 'ouvert à tous venants' . . . *Tel* . . . 2. L'indétermination peut être marquée par des propositions spéciales indéterminatives: 'Une autorité, quelle qu'elle soit, quelle qu'elle puisse être . . .' *Quel* + *nom* + *que:* . . . 'En quel lieu que ce soit . . .' Remarque: On a été longtemps indécis sur le choix entre *qui* et *qu'il, qu'elle* derrière *quelque:* 'Quelque disgrâce qui lui arrive, *ou* qu'il lui arrive . . ."' (p. 138-140).

Autre exemple: Livre XII, *Les faits par rapport à nos jugements, à nos sentiments, à nos volontés.* Section 1, *Questions, réponses, énonciations positives et négatives.* Section 2, *Les modalités et le langage.* Section 3. *Les modalités du jugement,* Chap. I. *Les certitudes.* Chap. II. *Les pensées et les croyances: On sait,*—Toute une série d'expressions traduisent l'idée de savoir; *Je sais, j'ai appris, reconnu, découvert, J'ai vu, entendu, senti* . . Remarque: On a tout-à-fait la même syntaxe si la proposition complétive, au lieu de dépendre d'un verbe, depend d'un substantif ou d'un adjectif de même signification, *assurance, conviction, avis,* etc. 'la preuve qu'il est complice . . .' *On ne sait pas* . . . *Après une interrogation: On croit* . . . [Pour bien comprendre la méthode, ajoutons que le verbe *penser* paraît aussi dans le chap. I *Les certitudes* (pour marquer une nuance de certitude); ex: 'Mon tailleur m'a envoyé des bas de soie que j'ai pensé ne mettre jamais'] (527-529).

On voit ainsi: 1. Que si les mots, *verbe, sujet, indicatif, adverbe, substantif, adjectif* sont employés fréquemment, ils le sont comme fortuitement; 2. Qu'on emploie à leur place, plus volontiers des termes concrets de la langue: le 'mot' *tel,* le 'mot' *certain,* les mots *pouvoir, devoir,* les 'groupes de mots' *on sait, qui sait si;* 3. Que les règles sont interjetées selon que la fortune les amène; 4. Et qu'enfin tout est bien subordonné aux idées—ou nuances d'idées—, de *détermination,* de *fait,* de *jugement,* de *volonté,* de *croyance,* de *possibilité* etc.

Voici, aussi consciencieusement que nous avons pu l'exposer, la méthode préconisée par M. Brunot, opposée à l'ancienne méthode où les éléments e grammaire et les règles de syntaxe sont rattachés à un arrangement des matières par parties du discours.

Il est certain, d'abord, qu'à première vue, cette méthode est extrêmement séduisante. On comprend bien l'impatience d'un homme comme M. Brunot qui a tant étudié les possibilités d'ex-

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

pression de la langue, et qui souffre de les voir étriquées par des notions simplistes comme verbe, pronom, conjonction, par des catégories grammaticales somme sujet, complément, proposition, par des règles souvent capricieuses au possible. Nous mêmes qui sommes moins conscients que lui, pour les avoir moins étudiées, de tant de nuances et de tant de virtualités nous en souffrons. Il serait merveilleux pour l'expression, que la pensée qu'on désire exprimer conduise spontanément et sans effort aux mots et aux formes et aux règles, qui, eux, se mouleraient sur l'idée au lieu que l'idée doive s'asservir à des éléments tout formels. La question est de savoir si cette méthode, si fascinante dans la théorie, est pratiquement viable. Or, c'est une révolution si profonde qu'il est permis d'user de quelque prudence avant de se prononcer; et, de fait, on ne voit pas comment un jugement équitable serait possible avant que nous ayons sous les yeux une grammaire travaillée systématiquement, et d'un bout à l'autre, selon les principes.

Jusqu'ici nous ne l'avons pas. Nous avons cependant quelques témoignages que d'avance nous offre M. Brunot. Des tentatives d'application partielle ont été faites. Dès 1903 M. Brunot publiait en collaboration avec M. Bony, des 'Méthodes élémentaires' dont la dernière est de 1908. D'autre part, après que la méthode eut subi une nouvelle période d'incubation et de perfectionnement, plusieurs collègues—entre autres M. Frey, du Lycée Michelet en ont fait dans des classes l'application "avec un tel succès qu'un inspecteur général m'en disait son ébahissement" (XXI). Enfin, nous savons que ce fut aussi la méthode d'enseignement mise en œuvre dans l'Ecole de Préparation des Professeurs de Français à l'Etranger dès le moment où elle fut fondée à la Sorbonne sous le haut patronage de M. Brunot—école qui a rendu déjà en quelques années des services si signalés.

Peut-être nous permettra-t-on de formuler ici une remarque d'un intéret en quelque sorte local. Si nous considérions la question de l'introduction en Amérique de la méthode préconisée dans *La Pensée et la Langue,* nous serions disposés à observer pour le moment du moins, une particulière prudence. La raison en est que nous sortons à peine d'une longue et funeste période de dilettantisme dans l'enseignement de la grammaire française—dilettantisme pratiqué longtemps sous le couvert de la Méthode dite 'naturelle'—, et que nous luttons encore pour ramener une salu-

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

taire discipline. Or, sans doute, quand nous lisons que M. Brunot attaque les règles de grammaire, il faut entendre (selon l'esprit et non selon la lettre) les *mauvaises* règles de la grammaire actuelle; mais il est à craindre que si on allait dès aujourd'hui inaugurer une croisade nouvelle contre la grammaire—au moins si on le faisait sans spécification très précise—cela permettrait à des maîtres impatients de toute discipline (et le ciel sait qu'il n'en manque point) de nous plonger à nouveau dans le lâche et l'à peu près linguistique dont nous sortons.

D'autre part, il semble y avoir de différents côtés—et même en Amérique—une poussée vers les réformes. Et certes, M. Brunot en est l'interprète le plus autorisé. Il est donc urgent que ces matières soient dès aujourd'hui considérées, discutées; que les esprits se préparent à recevoir l'évangile nouveau. C'est avec l'idée de favoriser cette fermentation que nous croyons utile de terminer par une observation à l'adresse de ceux qui se montreraient induement timorés. En relisant attentivement les différents chapitres de *La Pensée et la Langue* on se rendra compte que la réforme n'est tout de même pas tout à fait aussi radicale qu'il le semblait à première lecture. Car, peut-être bien, lorsque la méthode aura été mise en œuvre sous forme d'une grammaire à mettre entre les mains des élèves, s'apercevra-t-on qu'il ne s'agit pas exactement d'abandonner le système des parties du discours, mais plutôt d'abandonner seulement ces parties du discours *qui sont aujourd'hui adoptées* et qui nous enchaînent parce qu'elles sont vraiment trop limitantes,—de les abandonner, mais de les remplacer par d'autres moins rigides, . . . et peut-être plus nombreuses.

Mais, quelle que soit d'ailleurs l'issue du débat sur cette question des parties du discours, le volume de M. Brunot convaincra chacun qu'il y a quelque chose à faire—beaucoup à faire—pour renouveler notre conception de l'enseignement de la grammaire; pour *l'assouplir.*[1] Il y a des possibilités d'expression en dehors de celles classifiées dans nos livres de classes et qu'on ne doit pas ignorer. Il y a même des impondérables, tels le ton, le contexte (le con-

[1] C'est "assouplir," par exemple, qui est le but des exercices Robert qui se répandent de plus en plus dans les écoles et Colleges américains (Cf. *Lettres de Mon Moulin*, Heath & Co.; et pour d'autres textes, chez l'auteur, Smith College); et il y a une parenté d'esprit très nette entre ces exercices et les principes de M. Brunot.

Digitized by Google

Original from
UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

texte surtout: ainsi le mot *charger* ayant un sens tout différente selon qu'il s'agit d'un cocher ou d'un cuirassier; une même phrase signifiant en quelque sorte des choses contraires: 'Faire faire un habit à son tailleur'; 'Faire faire un habit à son fils'). Il faudra en tenir compte.

ALBERT SCHINZ.

Smith College.

A Dutch Source for Robinson Crusoe. The Narrative of the El-Ho "Sjouke Gabbes" (also known as Heinrich Texel). An Episode from the Description of the Mighty Kingdom of Krinke Kesmes, Et cetera. By Hendrik Smeeks, 1708. *Translated from the Dutch and Compared with the Story of Robinson Crusoe.* By LUCIUS L. HUBBARD. Ann Arbor: George Wahr, 1921.

The study of sources has for long been one of the chief fields of literary investigation, and a new discovery in it is usually a matter of general interest. When this discovery involves one of the most famous pieces in all literature, the interest naturally increases in proportion, just as does the value of the results. If this truth be admitted, then Mr. Hubbard's monograph on *A Dutch Source for Robinson Crusoe* should be one of the most important recent works in scholarly literature, especially when his conclusions enable him to state with certainty that there "can be no reasonable doubt that Defoe knew this book, and perhaps little. that he had it by him when he wrote parts of his *Robinson* . . ."[1]

The question of the relationship between *Sjouke Gabbes* and *Robinson Crusoe* has already aroused considerable discussion. It had been broached in Dutch before Mr. Hubbard presented it in English, and Mr. Hubbard gives credit to his predecessors from 1907 onward—to Staverman, Hoogewerff, Naber, and Polak (the last in German).[2] His own work, however, being the most complete on the subject and coming from the English side, has elicited the

[1] Hubbard, p. xxii. For similar assertions of Defoe's debt and imitation see pp. xiii, xv, xlii, li, etc.

[2] *Ib.*, pp. xxii, xxix-xxxv. Hubbard fails, however, to give credit to W. P. Trent for pointing out the same parallel in English. See Trent's ed. of *Crusoe* (Boston, 1916), p. xxv.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

most attention. Here may be noted the review by W. van Maanen,[3] which accepts Mr. Hubbard's conclusions with patriotic gratitude for the "restitution" of credit; the review by Julius Goebel,[4] which agrees that "Defoe received not only the first suggestion of his story from the Dutch Robinsonade but also numerous details of plot and, what is still more important, the most essential motives . . ."; and the review by Joseph Wood Krutch,[5] which accuses Hubbard of overstating his case and absolves Defoe from any taint of theft, and which thus corroborates the position taken by Staverman in opposition to that of his Dutch successors.

In the face of these preceding articles it is not necessary to present here a summary of the episode of *Sjouke Gabbes,* since it goes without saying that we are dealing with the tale of a man left alone in a desert land to fend for himself, just as in Crusoe's case. The burden of the proof, however, is on Mr. Hubbard to show that Defoe knew this narrative and used it in his vastly more popular work. Let us examine this evidence both as Mr. Hubbard presents it in his introduction, and as Professor Goebel re-presents it and buttresses it.

The first question is, since there exists no translation into English or any other language with which Defoe is known to be familiar, Could Defoe read the story in the original? Professor Goebel holds that in view of Defoe's travels and his religious and political sentiments it "seems scarcely credible" that he "should have been ignorant of the language of this country," especially since he had a Dutch grammar in his library.[6] The chief direct proofs of Defoe's knowledge, however, seem to be two: he once uses the Dutch sailor phrase of "den wild zee"; and his only use of the English word "skipper" corresponds to a similar episode in *Sjouke Gabbes* where Smeeks used the common Dutch "schipper."[7]

Next, the plots of the two works are quite similar in general outline: the hero finds himself alone on a desert island, builds himself a fortified hut, makes clothes, fashions utensils, kills game, is attacked by natives, etc. At least two points are especially pro-

[3] W. van Maanen, *English Studies* (Amsterdam), v, (1923), 136-9.
[4] Goebel, *JEGP.*, XXII (1923), 302-13.
[5] Krutch, *New York Evening Post Lit. Rev.*, III (Sept. 9, 1922), 12.
[6] Goebel, *loc. cit.*, p. 303.
[7] Hubbard, *op. cit.*, pp. xxxii, xlv, 18.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

vocative here: he finds a dog on a ship which is wrecked on his island, and he discovers human footprints in the sand. In addition, Professor Goebel believes that Defoe owes the whole characterization, motivation, and psychological development of his hero to the "carefully drawn" Dutch sketch. Here he instances especially the religious experiences of the two men, the semi-Utopian colonies described, and the general atmosphere of the two works, in spite of certain changes made by Defoe the dissenter. "Even the life-like realism for which Defoe is justly praised had its prototype in the vivid realistic style of the Dutch story." Under this head fall such things as the use of corroborative detail, simplicity, and the autobiographical point of view.[8] Professor van Maanen also agrees with these proofs.

It is therefore perhaps with considerable temerity that I range myself on the side of Staverman and Krutch, and that I ask all so far unprejudiced readers to take the same attitude. How much of this ingeniously constructed argument for Defoe's plagiarism is actually based on proof and how much on fascinating, yet only specious, possibilities? Please note that I do not say that Defoe knew nothing of the Dutch tale. No one would put it beyond Defoe to make such a use of another's material. I merely wish to ask whether scholarly-minded readers are willing, now and in the future, to accept such demonstrations of possibility as proof.

Let us examine *Robinson Crusoe* and *Sjouke Gabbes* from the point of view of one who is not committed to a thesis—of one who does not assume the relationship on one page and then take the assumption as admitted truth on the next.[9] The results of this examination will perhaps be more obvious if another possible source may be brought into the discussion—not the adventures of Selkirk, but the picaresque German tale by Grimmelshausen, *Der Abenteuerliche Simplicissimus* (1669). Altho this very popular romance has long been discarded by most literary historians as a

[8] Goebel, pp. 303-12, *passim*. See also Hubbard's introduction.

[9] Mr. Hubbard does practically this thing thruout most of his introduction, both in his rather insidious references to his main thesis as being already proved while he is still in the process of proving certain subsidiary arguments, and in his application of the putative principle of Defoe's "adopted method" of "modification" and "contradiction" in order to conceal any indebtedness. This fallacy is particularly apparent in the conclusions drawn from the bird episode (Hubbard, pp. xlvii-viii).

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

source for *Crusoe,* Mr. Hubbard (and with him Professors Goebel and van Maanen) rather inconsistently admits that it may even be a common source for both Smeeks and Defoe.[10] And surely quite as good a case can be made for *Simplicissimus* as for *Sjouke Gabbes.*

Did Defoe know Dutch? As probably as that he knew German; but so far no one has proved either as a fact. He had a Dutch grammar in his library, but so have I a Spanish dictionary in mine —and have never tried to read a line of Spanish in my life. Moreover, even if I had, would my attempt allow the inference that I had translated—let us say—Baroja's *El Camino de Perfectión?* I did not know there was such a novel until I had looked it up for the purpose of this illustration. As for saying that Defoe knew Dutch because his commercial ventures might take him to Holland—the conclusion follows no more irresistibly than if I were to maintain that a young American in his twenties must know Frenssen's *Jörn Uhl* (for instance) because he might have been a member of the American Army of Occupation during the late Armistice. But Defoe's knowledge of *Simplicissimus,* on the other hand, is more likely, for he did not need to meet it in German or in Germany. A translation of the German novel seems to have been advertised for Baldwin in 1688, not long after Defoe's return from the Continent.[11] Altho the project appears never to have come to print, is it not pleasant to imagine that Defoe, in his peregrinations among the Grub Street publishers, may have happened upon the author's manuscript, and used the desert island incident therein for his own later purposes? It is pleasant to imagine, but there the scholar must stop.—Does it need to be added that there seem to be no undoubted verbal reminiscences of Smeeks in Defoe?

As for plot, as strong a parallel can be drawn between *Crusoe* and *Simplicissimus* as between *Crusoe* and *Sjouke Gabbes*—if the right incidents be selected. Robinson and Simplicissimus are both wrecked on their island; Sjouke is merely left behind after being lost. Simplicissimus is companioned for a time by an ignorant young

[10] Hubbard, p. xliv; van Maanen, p. 138; Goebel, pp. 305, 306.

[11] See Charlotte Morgan, *Rise of the English Novel of Manners* (Columbia University Press, 1911), p. 200, no. 359. Unfortunately, however, Miss Morgan, as she writes me, failed to take down the source of her information.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

shipmate, whose function is much like that of Friday for the short while he is alive; Sjouke is always entirely alone. Robinson and Simplicissimus both build their homes in similar locations, for safety as well as convenience; Sjouke does the same, but Crusoe arranged a cave for refuge in case of need, and Simplicissimus retired into a damp, rocky cave on the arrival of the Dutch ship, having provisioned it as did Crusoe. The occupations of all three heroes are essentially the same, even to the composition of their biographies and their preoccupation with religion. Simplicissimus is finally carried away from his island by cannibals; Sjouke's captors do not seem to be cannibals, but Crusoe's enemies are. And so on. Indeed, the same "method" of "modification" and "contradiction" may be observed in the German story as in the Dutch, in many points of divergence in the English. Crusoe was deeply thankful for not having been cast on the coast of Africa—which was the scene of Simplicissimus's last adventures.[12] Crusoe thanked God for having supplied him with food, tools, weapons, etc.—things which Simplicissimus did not have, and the lack of which brought him to the very condition imagined by Crusoe.[13] These specimens of the possibilities of the material will perhaps suffice.

But how about the two very striking incidents of the dog and the footprints? In the first case, the very fact that neither Sjouke nor Crusoe was surprised at discovering a dog in such a situation indicates that it was more or less of a custom for a ship to carry a dog on a voyage. Crusoe, indeed, found a dog on both the first wreck and the Spanish wreck. In the second case, the circumstances of the footprints are so entirely different as to make the common incident devoid of value, for the footprints Sjouke sees are not those of the savages, but are apparently those of the shipmates who had left him behind. Moreover, since footprints are mentioned twice in Sjouke's story (altho he does not see them himself the first time), the recurrence would seem to show the lack of originality in the incidents. Here, as in other cases of superficial similarity, the resemblance arises from, and is dictated by, the situation.

[12] *Crusoe* (Bohn ed., London, 1893), p. 51.
[13] *Ib.*, pp. 100-1.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

From the point of view of plot continuity it is interesting to compare the order of events in Hubbard's parallel columns, inasmuch as Defoe with little "reasonable doubt" had the Dutch book "by him" when he wrote. So that it will not seem that I am choosing the best passage to illustrate my point, I shall begin at the beginning of his text in setting down the page numbers in his edition of *Robinson* which he places opposite his Dutch story as it unfolds: 61; II, 255; 80, 48, 54, 54, 73, 76, 96, 85, 54, 223, 181, 54, 225, 61, 53, 66, 95, 117, 59, 115, 116, 211, 80, 181, etc. If Defoe took the trouble to build his story up from such a patchwork as this, it would certainly seem to the normal observer as if he had set himself a harder job than if he had done it all from his own imagination originally.

And is it safe to attach any importance to the moralizing in the two books and to their adoption of similar tricks of style? Teutonic readers of the middle classes—English or Dutch or German—have always demanded such fare, and especially in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. Examination of other works of fiction in the same period would often reveal the same treatment—compare, for instance, the works of Mrs. Manley or the elaborations on fact in the Mary Carleton narratives and the 'Newgate' biographies. Moreover, autobiographical narratives, journals, and letters were conventional methods of achieving the effect of reality by such documentation.[14] Islands far from known civilization go back at least to Plato, and the travels and explorations from the Renaissance onward would naturally foster an interest in such matter. *Crusoe* was well along in the tradition of such stories of uninhabited islands and shipwrecked mariners, for it is certain that such adventures were not uncommon in both fiction and reality.[15] Defoe himself, in telling of Crusoe's later career, speaks of how "the famous pirate Kidd . . . set the captain on shore on an uninhabited island, and ran away with the ship."[16] Desert island novels have also been common in French literature, and their simi-

[14] Cf. Tiege, "A Peculiar Phase of the Theory of Realism in Pre-Richardsonian Fiction," *PMLA.*, XXVIII (1913), 213 ff.

[15] F. Wackwitz, *Entstehungsgeschichte von D. Defoes "Robinson Crusoe"* (Berlin, 1909), investigates many of Defoe's predecessors in this field, confining his work to English material alone.

[16] *Crusoe* (ed. cit.), p. 371.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

larities to the *Crusoe* material have often been alluded to.[17] A list of all *Crusoe's* predecessors would be no slight task to compile.[18] The episode in the sixth book of *Simplicissimus,* the episode of Sjouke in the larger tale of *Krinke Kesmes,* and the story of Robinson Crusoe merely gave a new turn to a type of story implied in the *Utopia,* later on in *Gulliver's Travels,* etc. There was no more need for Defoe to have imitated Smeeks or Grimmelshausen than for the author of *Beowulf* to have imitated Homer.

After all, however, the results of this analysis of the relationship between *Crusoe* and *Sjouke Gabbes* are not the important thing. Nor is the review to be construed primarily as an attack on any particular writer. But it is to be interpreted as a "study in source-study," and in the methods in vogue in too many quarters today. The possibility of suggesting a source-relationship between either the Dutch or the German novel and the English one with even the degree of plausibility which has been indicated above ought to have the same sort of general effect as M. Bédier's recent strictures on his own earlier 'genealogical' method of establishing manuscript texts:[19] it ought to recommend a still greater caution and a still greater skepticism than are now beginning to obtain in the field of literary scholarship, and especially in the field of literary relationships.

ARTHUR H. NETHERCOT.

Northwestern University.

The Poems of Charles Cotton 1630-1687. Edited with an introduction and notes, by John Beresford. New York: Boni and Liveright, 1923.

For at least two decades there has been a marked revival of interest in English lyrical poetry of the seventeenth century, and numerous new editions are gradually making accessible lyrics long

[17] See, for example, G. Atkinson's "A French Desert Island Novel of 1708," *PMLA.*, XXXVI (1921), 509 ff., *passim,* and his book on the subject.

[18] It would well begin with the above-mentioned works and those set down in *Camb. Hist. Engl. Lit.*, IX, 476; Esdaile, *English Tales and Prose Romances,* pp. xxx-xxxi; Chinard, *L'Amérique et le rêve exotique,* pp. 248-50; and Le Breton, *Le Roman au XVIIIe siècle,* p. 312.

[19] In the preface to his recent revision of his own old edition of *Le lai de l'ombre.*

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

available only to scholars and collectors. A useful addition to these is Mr. John Beresford's volume. It fairly establishes the editor's claim that it is "the first complete edition of Cotton's shorter poems," and although it does not contain *The Battle of Ivry,* or the whole of Cotton's translations, it does contain all the rest of the material of the 1689 edition, the only extensive one hitherto extant, and various other poems. These have been re-arranged—if the jumbled order of 1690 can be called an arrangement at all—according to the subject matter, the spelling has been modernized, and some pertinent notes, chiefly historical and biographical, have been added. The preface contains a good brief life of Cotton, as well as some critical observations. The whole makes a well-bound volume of 420 pp. Sir Peter Lely's portrait of Cotton is reproduced as frontispiece.

Charles Cotton was one of "the mob of gentlemen who wrote with ease," and while there may be a pious exaggeration (the editor is descended from Captain John Beresford, a cousin of Cotton's) in Mr. Beresford's assertion that "the true genius of Cotton . . . lay in his poetry," and while there may be little substantial injustice in the fame which connects his name inevitably with the *Compleat Angler,* this poetry is distinctive and worth preserving, and it was not for nothing that it was admired by Charles Lamb and even by that less genial critic, Wordsworth.

Yet Cotton seems, like many of his contemporaries, to have begun as a mere imitator. Like Dryden, he was one of the "divers persons of nobility and worth" who contributed elegies on Lord Hastings to Brome's *Lachrymae Musarum* in 1650. Dryden was eighteen and Cotton nineteen when Hastings died, it was sixteen years after the publication of Donne's collected poems, and the tide of "metaphysical" wit had not yet begun to ebb. Hence we find Cotton writing [1]

> Weep, ladies, weep, lament great Hastings' fall;
> His house is buried in his funerall:
> Bathe him in tears, till there appear no trace
> Of those sad blushes in his lovely face, &c

Hastings (Mr. Beresford neglects to remind us) died of the small-pox. Some innate spring of common-sense keeps Cotton's "sad

[1] P. 247 of the present volume.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

blushes" on this side of absurdity: young Dryden was less judicious, and elaborated thus:

> Each little pimple had a tear in it
> To wail the fault its rising did commit.

Here, of course, Cotton, like Dryden, was simply following a style, with no particular model in mind. But sometimes his indebtedness is so specific and close as to suggest conscious imitation. Mr. Beresford informs us in his biographical note that Cotton was a close friend of Lovelace, but he makes no comment on Cotton's *Ode to Chloris,* which begins[2]

> Farewell, my Sweet, until I come,
> Improved in merit, for thy sake,
> With Characters of Honour home,
> Such as thou canst not then but take.
>
> To Loyalty my love must bow,
> My Honour too calls to the Field,
> Where, for a lady's busk, I now
> Must keen, and sturdy iron yield.

It is not an improvement on Lovelace. Again, a poem called *Advice* nearly but not quite catches the manner of Suckling:[3]

> If she relent not, as I doubt her),
> Never make more ado about her,
> To sigh and whimper is no boot;
> Go, hang thyself, and that will do't.

Cotton's *The Storm* shows indebtedness to Donne's more famous poem of the same name; e. g., Donne's

> And as sin-burden'd soules from graves will creepe,
> At the last day, some forth their cabins peepe:
> And tremblingly aske what news

becomes[4]

> Such as from under hatches thrust a head
> T'enquire what news, seem'd rising from the dead.

Much of Cotton's verse, then, is imitative, and some, it may be added, is highly indecorous. But the same may be said of most seventeenth century poets—and, after all, Cotton did not take poetry too seriously, even his own. He writes[5]

[2] P. 184.
[3] P. 152.
[4] Pp. 88.
[5] P. 113.

Digitized by Google
Original from
UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

And though to verse great reverence is due
Yet what most poets write proves so untrue,
It renders truth in verse suspected too.

And having described Mrs. Anne King as[6]

the only she
Deserves the gen'ral eulogy,

he adds

The praise of all the rest is Poetry.

Sometimes Cotton's poetry is philosophic; his "Pindaric ode" on Death contains lines which seem akin to Wordsworth's *Intimations:*[7]

So soon as life is tasted,
Lest we should happy be
Even in our infancy,
Our joys are quashed, our hopes are blasted.

Wordsworth had doubtless read this poem, though of course it is not necessary to infer that his idea of "shades of the prison-house" originated here.

Cotton's best poems are certainly his nature poems, and these show a genuine love of country life, not common in his day. Best of them all is, of course, *The Retirement;* it deserves all the praise that has at various times been lavished upon it. In some of his love poems, and in nearly all of his nature poems, Cotton justifies Mr. Beresford's remark that[8] "The subject, the turn of the verse, and the 'wit' are of the seventeenth century, but the imagery is that of Burns or Wordsworth."

BEN C. CLOUGH.

Brown University.

CORRESPONDENCE

BIRNAM WOOD: 700 A. D.–1600 A. D.

While engaged in a study of the latinity of the *Liber Historiae Francorum,* of the eighth century, for a doctoral dissertation, I came upon a plot which passing through several centuries eventually attained popularity as the "Birnam Wood" of *Macbeth.* The

[6] P. 126.
[7] P. 221.
[8] P. 27.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

story is found in the *Monumenta Germaniae Historica: Scriptorum Rerum Merovingicarum,* II, *Liber Historiae Francorum,* par. 36. An English rendering somewhat abridged of the stilted Latin runs as follows:[1]

Fredegundis with Landericus and the remaining Frankish leaders assembles an army. . . She gave advice to the Franks, saying "By night let us rise against them (the enemy) with torches, our companions carrying branches in their hands and placing bells upon their horses so that the sentinel-guards of the enemy may not recognize us. At daybreak let us rush upon them and perhaps we shall slay them . . . when she had counseled them, rising together in the night clad in armor, with branches in their hands, they came to Trucia, she carrying little King Chlotharius in her arms.

Furness in his 5th Variorum edition of *Macbeth* mentions several stories of moving woods which seem to have no bearing on Birnam Wood. However on page 398 of this edition we find under Simrock, *Die Quellen Shakespeares,* 1870, 2nd ed., II, 256, a short sketch of an attack by Fredegundis almost identical with the one found in the *Liber Historiae Francorum.* This sketch, which Furness quotes from Simrock, is found in Grimm's *Deutsche Sagen.*[2] Grimm states that his source is Aimoinus, III, 82. A translation of the passage, considerably abridged, follows:[3]

In dark night the army rising entered the forest. with Landericus leading. Some cut branches from trees and holding them and placing bells on their horses's necks, urged their comrades to follow their example. Others, in emulation, cutting off branches of trees and at the same time snatching bells, were early in order to appear in the enemy camps. In the meantime Fredegundis, holding Chlotharius in her arms, preceded the army to the place prepared for the fray, so that pity for the child should affect them—the child whom they would see made a captive by the king if they were conquered.

---

[1] " . . . Fredegundis cum Landerico et reliquos Francorum duces hostem congregat . . . consilium dedit Francos . . . dicens: De nocte consurgamus contra eos cum lucernis, portantes socii, qui nos precedunt, ramis silvarum in manibus, tintinnabolis super equos legatis ut nos cognoscere ipsorum vigiles custodes hostium non queant. Inluciscente inicium diei, inruamus super eos, et forsitan eos devincimus . . . illa sicut consilium dederat, de nocte consurgens, cum ramis in manibus . . . Chlothario parvolo rege in brachia vehitans, usque Trucia pervenerunt, etc."

[2] *Deutsche Sagen,* herausgegeben von den Brüdern Grimm, II, 56. The reference in Furness's *Macbeth* is Grimm's *German Popular Tales,* II, 91. This title is misleading and the page reference incorrect.

[3] Migne, *Patrologiae Latinae,* CXXXIX, *Aimoinus Monachus Floriacenses,* III, 82. " . . . Intempesta nocte surgens exercitus, silvam Landerico ducente est ingressus. Qui . . . ramum praecidit arboris, suspensumque tintinnabulum collo equi cui insidebat ferens, hortatur socios ut suum omnes sequantur exemplum. Qui certatim arborum praecisis remis, arreptis una tintinnabulis, . . . matutini hostilibus astitere castris. Interea Fredegundis Clotarium filium suum propriis gestans ulnis, usque ad locum certaminis armatum praecedebat exercitum, ut miseratio eos infantis accenderet, quem si victi forent, captivum de rege facturi videbantur."

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

The similarity of the episode in the work of Aimoinus, written about the 10th century,[4] and of that in the *Liber Historiae Francorum,* written about the 8th century,[5] is undeniable and easily explained. For among several other sources which Aimoinus consulted are mentioned *les Gestes des Français*[6] (no exact paragraphs being cited however). *Les Gestes des Français* are the *Gesta Francorum,* a title sometimes used for the *Liber Historiae Francorum.*

We can now see that the earliest known story of the attack of Fredegundis arose in the *Liber Historiae Francorum.* And before abandoning Furness and his sources, to go on to the *pièce de résistance* of our article, we take the liberty of pointing out that the story of Frédégonde, written in old French and quoted by Dr. J. C. Ritter (Programm der Realschule zu Leer, 1871), *Croniques de St. Denis,* Bibl. Imp., Paris, Cod. 10298 f. 17, and given by Furness on page 399 of the Variorum edition, is no other than an adaptation of the original story of Fredegundis found in the *Liber Historiae Francorum.*

We are told by Furness, page 379 of the same edition, that "Holinshed is Shakespeare's authority, Hector Boèce is Holinshed's and Boèce follows Fordun, adding to him very freely." What Boèce adds, among other stories, to Fordun is the moving of Birnam Wood which F. J. Amours in his elaborate and scholarly edition of Andrew Wyntoun's Chronicles states is found only in Wyntoun.[7] Boswell-Stone further adds in *Shakespeare's Holinshed,* 42, note, that "the removal of Birnam Wood seems to have been a tradition in Wyntoun's age (14th century)." Wyntoun was born about 1350.[8] Boèce lived about 100 years later.[9] It seems plausible and more than probable that Boèce, himself the author of a history of Scotland, read Wyntoun, the great Scotch Chronicler, from whose work he took the story of Birnam Wood. The situation as most recently outlined by Amours seems to be that it is in Wyntoun that we first hear of Birnam Wood. But Wyntoun gives no indication as to whence he drew his idea of the moving forest, a problem which indeed Amours himself has unwillingly left unelucidated.[10]

An examination of the sources used by Wyntoun in his Chron-

[4] *Encycl. Brit.* XIth ed., s. v. Aimoin.

[5] *Monumenta Germaniae Historica, Scriptorum Rerum Morovingicarum,* II, 217.

[6] Migne, 619, *op. cit.*

[7] F. J. Amours, *The Original Chronicle of Andrew Wyntoun,* edited with introd., notes and glossary, by F. J. Amours, 1914, William Blackwood and Sons, Edinburgh and London, I, 66.

[8] *Encycl. Brit.* XIth ed., s. v. Wyntoun.

[9] *Ibid.*, s. v. Boèce.

[10] *The Original Chronicle of Andrew Wyntoun,* ed. by F. J. Amours, I, lxxxiii.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

icle reveals a significant fact. Amours in his discussion of the sources of Wyntoun's Chronicle, I, lxxiv, informs us that the chronicler mentions twice the celebrated Vincent of Beauvais, the great encyclopedist of the 13th century, author of the *Speculum Maius,* of which a part is called the *Speculum Historiale* and seems to have been known to Wyntoun.

In this *Speculum Historiale,* III, bk. xxiii, ch. 3, I have found a passage containing the attack of Fredegundis on the Austrasians and Burgundians, so similar to that quoted above from the *Liber Historiae Francorum* that I shall not reproduce it here. Moreover Vincent of Beauvais states that it comes from the *Historia Francorum.* Vincent of Beauvais generally gives his sources, and when we find the works of Gregory of Tours mentioned as the source for some passages, Helinandus for others, etc., and the *Historia Francorum* for passages that correspond in practically all details to those in the *Liber* it is a foregone conclusion that the *Historia Francorum* and the *Liber Historiae Francorum* are one book.

Our "moving wood" traveled far. Used first in the *Liber Historiae Francorum,* in the fascinating story of the attack of Fredegundis on the Burgundians and Austrasians, it was taken in its original setting by Vincent of Beauvais and placed in his enormous work. Wyntoun, probably seeing its great dramatic possibilities, wove it into the partly historical, partly fanciful story later introduced in *Macbeth.* From him Boèce drew this incident, and thus from Wyntoun to Boèce, Boèce to Holinshed, Holinshed to Shakespeare the moving wood of the *Liber* went its way as Birnam Wood.

PAULINE TAYLOR.

Columbia University.

BODMER INDEBTED TO DANTE

Bodmer's *Noah* had many sources. One of these was the *Divine Comedy.* As the first evidence of Bodmer's indebtedness to Dante I present the following parallels. In the course of his wanderings, as recounted in the *Noah,* Sem finally arrives at a pyramid. It is the chamber thereof that Bodmer makes the scene of the tragic ending of Hadad and his thirty sons, all of whom are represented as having died there a horrible death by starvation—a reminiscence of the well-known motif of Ugolino and his sons.[1]

[1] Cf. Dante's *Divine Comedy.* Inferno XXXIII. Bodmer, I may add, used the same theme in his tragedy *Der Hungerturm in Pisa* (1769). This drama, however, is not, as Mörikofer erroneously states in his *Schweizerische Literatur* (page 219), a parody of Gerstenberg's gruesome tragedy *Ugolino.* The two tragedies, it seems, were written at almost the same

Digitized by Google   Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

Save for the different cause of the tragedy in each of the two accounts,[2] Bodmer's version is throughout a clear paraphrase of Dante's, nay, virtually a free translation thereof. In both versions we have the prophetic dream and the lean hounds which rend the sides of the unfortunate human beings; the father awakes and hears his sons weeping in their sleep and asking for bread; the sons awake, there is the ominous sound at the door, the father gazes in silence into the faces of his sons; he cannot weep, so stony does he grow within; but his sons weep, and in Dante's account one of them asks: "Thou lookest so, father, what ails thee?" which is paralleled in the *Noah* by the words: "Wie siehst du so scharf, mein Vater!" The heartrending sight of the haggard faces of his sons makes the father realize the starving aspect of his own; for very grief, according to Dante, he bites his hands, while Bodmer represents him in his frenzy as biting his arm. But there is no need of recalling more of the details of the story. Suffice it to say that the same close correspondence, feature for feature, runs throughout the two parallel versions even to the point of the horrible climax where the father, driven by the pangs and delirium of hunger, feeds upon the dead bodies of his own sons. Indeed, it is no exaggeration to say that Bodmer was careful not to omit a single salient detail of the Dantean story.

In conclusion one other correspondence may be pointed out. Raphael's recital of his experiences in the abode of the unfortunates[3] recalls Dante's wanderings through the Inferno under guidance of Virgil, a particularly notable parallel being the interviews with the dead which Bodmer introduced into his epic in imitation of Dante.[4]

C. H. IBERSHOFF.

University of Iowa.

time. According to L. Donati in the *Bodmer Denkschrift* (p. 309) there is, however, among Bodmer's manuscripts "eine ungedruckte gegen Gerstenberg gerichtete Parodie *Das Parterre des Ugolino*." In this connection I may state that Bodmer's early interest in the Dantean motif is attested by the fact that the tale was already included in the *Noah* of 1752, indeed, even in his *Kritische Betrachtungen über die poetischen Gemälde der Dichter* (Zürich, 1741, p. 30) he refers to Dante's *Ugolino* and Michael Angelo's bas relief of the motif.

[2] In the *Noah* the victims are represented as having, at the time of the Flood, sought refuge in the chamber of the pyramid only to be doomed to die there. According to the Dantean version Ugolino with his sons dies a frightful death in prison. The historical account relates that Ugolino was charged by the Ghibellines with political treason, whereupon he was seized and with his sons and grandsons was cast into prison where all were left to starve to death.

[3] Cf. the *Noah*, edition of 1765, page 280 ff.

[4] Cf. the *Noah*, p. 286 and the Inferno XXXII.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

Uncollected Poems by Fontenelle.

The complete works of Fontenelle, as we know them to-day, have been accumulated in successive stages and by several additions.[1] The rather laborious compilation of his published or manuscript productions explains why his editors have overlooked two of his poems which appeared during his lifetime among a number of others which have been duly gathered in his collected writings.

These forgotten poems were printed in a short-lived periodical with a strange title, published in Holland in 1750 and 1751: *Le petit Réservoir contenant une variété de faits historiques et critiques, de littérature, de morale et de poésies, etc. et quelquefois de petites Avantures romanesques et galantes.* A La Haye, Chez Jean Neaulme. The publisher or rather the editor, the Abbé d'Artigny,[2] stated in vol. I that he would successively publish a number of poems by Fontenelle derived from a manuscript collection of his verse, which had, at that moment, not been printed in his collected works. Some of them were sent in by the Abbé Trublet, the friend and biographer of Fontenelle, whose testimony about their authenticity must be given great weight. He states in his *Mémoires sur M. de Fontenelle,*[3] "Je crois qu'on pourroit mettre les petites pièces . . . dans la nouvelle édition de M. de Fontenelle et d'autant plus que le public les a déjà. On les a recueillies dans un ouvrage périodique imprimé en Hollande sous le titre de *Petit Réservoir.* Le libraire qui me consulta, en connoissoit quelques-unes; je lui indiquai les autres."

All the poems from the *Petit Réservoir* are found in Fontenelle's works except two,[4] which I reprint here. The first, *Les Flèches d'Amour,* is an allegory on the power of money in love which bears a close resemblance in its method to Fontenelle's *Relation de l'Isle de Bornéo* of 1686. The second is only attributed to him, but it is also in his customary vein.

Petit Réservoir, vol. II, p. 377.

Les Flèches d'Amour, par M. de Fontenelle.

L'amour n'avoit jadis que des flèches d'acier,
  Ce n'étoit pas faire grande dépense;
Mais cela suffisoit pour un siècle grossier,
  Où tous les coeurs se rendoient sans défense.
  Le temps changea; plus de simplicité,
  Les traits d'acier devinrent inutiles;
Et l'amour eut affaire à des gens plus habiles,

[1] See Trublet. *Mémoires,* etc., in *Mercure de France* of 1756, published separately in 1761. Quérard, *La Fr. Litt.*

[2] Indicated as editor by Lachèvre, *Bibl. des Rec. Coll.,* III, p. 338.

[3] Pp. 35-36.

[4] I consulted the *Œuvres Complètes* of 1790, 1818, and 1825.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

Qui de les repousser prenoient la liberté.
S'ils blessoient, la blessure étoit bien-tôt guérie,
  Personne ne s'en trouvoit mal;
Quel remède? Il fallut changer de batterie!
  Il les fit d'un autre métal,
Ce fut d'or; à l'amour la victoire étoit sûre.
Quels ennemis, grands Dieux, n'auroit-il pas défaits?
Aussi, quoiqu'il parût d'abord se mettre en frais,
  Il regagna ses frais avec usure.
  A chaque flèche qui voloit,
Une foule de coeurs couroit au devant d'elle;
  Quoique la plaie en fût mortelle,
  N'étoit pas blessé qui vouloit.
L'amour ne lançoit plus ses flèches que par grâce,
Heureux les coeurs sur qui tomboient des traits si doux!
Souvent de les percer sa main se trouvoit lasse,
Lorsqu'ils ne l'étoient pas de recevoir ses coups;
Chacun d'eux eût reçu vingt flèches au lieu d'une;
  Chacun eût volontiers épuisé le carquois;
  Se faire blesser plusieurs fois
  C'étoit assez pour faire sa fortune.
  Cette mode n'a point changé,
Les flèches d'or sont toujours en usage,
Et, pour peu qu'on s'en serve, il n'est coeur si sauvage
Qui sous les lois d'amour ne soit bien-tôt rangé.

Petit Réservoir, vol. IV, p. 191.
Vers sur une maison à Névilles, attribués à M. de Fontenelle.

Je vois cet agréable lieu,
Ces bords riants, cette terrasse,
Où Courtin, La Fare et Chaulieu,
Loin du faux goût des gens en place,
Pensant beaucoup, écrivant peu,
Parmi les flaccons à la glace
Composoient des vers plains de feu:
Enfants d'Aristippe et d'Horace,
Des leçons du Portique instruits,
Tantôt ils en cueilloient les fruits
Et tantôt les fleurs du Parnasse:
Philosophes sans vanité,
Beaux esprits sans rivalité,
Entre l'étude et la paresse,
A côté de la volupté
Ils avoient placé la sagesse:
Où trouver encore dans Paris
Des moeurs et des talents semblables?
Il n'est que trop de Beaux Esprits,
Mais qu'il est peu de gens aimables!

GUSTAVE L. VAN ROOSBROECK.

University of Minnesota.

Digitized by Google
Original from
UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

La Rochefoucauld and the Character of Zimri

Between Dryden's character of Zimri and La Rochefoucauld's *Portrait du Cardinal de Retz* there are certain resemblances, indicating, though by no means proving, that the Englishman owed inspiration to the Frenchman. It is true that La Rochefoucauld's *Portrait* was not published till after *Absalom and Achitophel,* but the *Portrait* was circulating in manuscript several years before Dryden composed his work—as early as 1675.[1] I give the parallels.

Stiff in opinions, always in the wrong, Was everything by starts, and nothing long;	Il n'a point de goût, ni de délicatesse; il s'amuse à tout, et ne se plaît à rien. . . .
Railing and praising were his usual themes; And both, to show his judgment, in extremes;	
Thus, wicked but in will, of means bereft, He left not faction, but of that was left.	. . . il quitte la cour, où il ne peut s'attacher, et il s'éloigne du monde, qui s'éloigne de lui.

In determining the weight of these parallels, it should be remembered that they occur in short passages, for La Rochefoucauld's sketch is only about twice the length of Dryden's; and it should be noted that, in both cases, the strikingly unusual 'faction' witticism occurs at the same point—at the very close of the portraits.

F. B. Kaye.

Northwestern University.

Keats, Shelley, and Mrs. Radcliffe

It is of course a matter of common knowledge that Keats was to some extent, at least, acquainted with Mrs. Radcliffe's extravagant romances; and a most interesting and important contribution to this subject, lately made by Miss Martha Shackford[1] caused the writer of the present note to reread *The Mysteries of Udolpho* with a new interest. In the course of that reading some passages in the thirty-third chapter arrested my attention as it struck me that they contained elements markedly similar to the familiar lines in Keat's *Ode to a Nightingale:*

Charm'd magic casements, opening on the foam
Of perilous seas, in faery lands forlorn.

---

[1] See La Rochefoucauld, *Œuvres*, ed. Gilbert and Gourdault, I, 17.

[1] *P. M. L. A.*, XXXVI, 104-118.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

These are the sentences:

When Emily, in the morning, opened her *casement*,[2] she was surprised to observe the beauties, that surrounded it. . . . . a stream . . . . descending from the mountains, wound along the landscape, which it reflected, to a bay of the *sea*. There, far in the west, the waters, fading into the sky, assumed a tint of the faintest purple . . . . to her this spot was a bower of sweets, whose *charms* communicated imperceptibly to her mind somewhat of their own serenity.[3] . . . . Unwilling to encounter the coarse behaviour of the peasant's wife, she remained supperless in her room, while she wept again over her *forlorn* and *perilous* situation.[4]

Shelley, too, seems to have read the *Mysteries;* for the characters, Verezzi, Ugo, La Contessa di Laurentini, in *Zastrozzi*, and Cavigni in *St. Irvyne, or the Rosicrucian* are all named after characters in the Radcliffe romance, and Shelley's Bernardo, in *Zastrozzi* was perhaps also christened with one of Mrs. Radcliffe's characters, Bertrand, in mind. One situation, too, in the *Mysteries*,[5] where Montoni, lifting his goblet to drink a toast, is saved from death by the breaking of the glass, was probably the original of the incident in *St. Irvyne*[6] in which Cavigni is likewise saved from such a death by the intervention of Ginotti.

Walter E. Peck.

College of Wooster.

BRIEF MENTION

Sentences and Thinking. A Handbook of Composition and Revision, by Norman Foerster and J. M. Steadman. (Houghton Mifflin Company, 1923, xxxii + 330 pp.). A dozen years ago teachers of English composition used to wish for a handbook of usage suited to class-room use. Today there are several such books. Of these some are simply reference books of rules for grammar, spelling, punctuation, and diction. Others attempt to combine with such rules a brief treatment of the elementary principles of composition and thus to serve as a substitute for the older-fashioned text-book of rhetoric. The result is usually not happy, for the first essential of a good book on structure and style is generous citation of illustrative examples, and a handbook does not permit adequate illustration.

In *Sentences and Thinking* the mistake of attempting too much has been avoided. It is not, as the title might imply, a discussion of logic. It is merely an application of common sense to the whole problem of writing good sentences. Described in the sub-

[2] The word is frequently used in the course of the story; and the charming view from this particular window is repeatedly emphasized.

[3] *Mysteries of Udolpho*, ed. 1794, III, 197-201.

[4] *Ibid.*, III, 207.

[5] *Ibid.*, II, 403.

[6] Ch. I.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

title as a handbook of composition and revision, it is, and rightly so, chiefly a book of revision. Sentences are not the product of deliberate thinking. A successful writer does not consciously plan a sentence before he writes it any more than a strong man considers each stride as he walks. The thought shapes the sentences. Whether it shapes them well or ill is a question that should be deferred until the time for revision. The beginner, however, cannot hope to be a good critic of his own sentences, as he undertakes revision, unless he has already learned something of the resources of good sentence structure. It is chiefly to this mastery of elementary principles of style that the first part of the book is devoted.

The book is to be commended particularly for its insistence on the importance of grammar. As an example of its sanity, note this remark: "If the principle of parallelism gives us trouble, we may be reasonably certain that the cause of the trouble is our shabby acquaintance with grammatical forms. In this event the obvious remedy is to go back to our grammar and to study carefully, among other things, the parts of speech." This remedy might justly be proposed for other troubles besides those concerning parallelism. Good sentence structure is based on swift and clear perception of grammatical relations, just as good diction is based on memory and vividness of imagination. The theorists who a few years ago began to assure teachers that it is entirely unnecessary to give lessons in grammar wholly misconceived the purpose of grammar study.

The application of the logical method used in the first part of the book would, perhaps, have made the treatment of punctuation conform more closely to the needs of the sentence for pointing. A student should say, Here is need for separation; what point is required? and not, Here is the comma; what can I do with it?

The chapter on diction, good so far as it goes, seems somewhat inadequate. It is in words as such that students are most easily interested. Most persons, indeed, find some romance in the study of words, though they can discover none in abstract grammar. Consequently, it is in the treatment of diction that copious illustration is most fruitful. This does not mean that a discussion of correct diction must be primly exacting. The authors of this book show some tendency to schoolmaster the language. "I've got to," meaning I must, is colloquial but it is certainly not vulgar, and "I have got," meaning I possess, is well-established colloquial usage, based upon a natural grammatical tendency.

In general, *Sentences and Thinking* is a useful book, clear in arrangement and satisfactory in typography. As convenient handbooks multiply, the excuse for inefficient teaching of usage grows less and less.

J. C. F.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

A Handful of Pleasant Delights. Edited by Hyder E. Rollins (Cambridge, Harvard University Press, 1924. 145 pp.). Professor Rollins, in making accessible this "miscellany of broadside ballads composed 'by Clement Robinson and divers others,'" has done English scholars an excellent service. For many years these ballads have interested students, among whom may be mentioned Joseph Ritson, George Ellis, and Malone who "copied the entire book." In 1815 the *Handful* was finally edited by Thomas Park for the second volume of his *Heliconia;* but unfortunately his text was taken "from a very inaccurate transcript." James Crossley in 1871 issued a facsimile ("not altogether successful in that attempt") for the Spenser Society, but added nothing to Park's notes. In 1878 Arber's edition appeared which, though an improvement, likewise left something to be desired. Furthermore, all three editions are "practically unobtainable"; none, moreover, "treats the miscellany from the point of view of balladry." The need for a new edition is, therefore, obvious.

In his introduction, based upon earlier investigations (cf. *J. E. G. P.*, XVIII, 1919, 43-59), Mr. Rollins furnishes proof for 1566 (not, as hitherto supposed, 1584) as the date of the first edition of the *Handful.* Accordingly, "the book immediately assumes a much more important rank in the history of Elizabethan literature than that heretofore granted it. Suggested, no doubt, by the success of *Tottel's,*—which had reached a fourth edition in 1565,—the *Handful,* following in 1566, became the second, and not the fourth, poetical miscellany." That Shakspere shows acquaintance with some of the ballads is well-known. Inasmuch as the volume appeared two years after his birth, it may be that he knew it while still in his teens. Possibly, therefore, here is another book that will throw light on the "background" of the Stratford youth. Meanwhile, however, it is well to remember that some of the songs alluded to in his plays did not appear in the first edition.

In addition to the list of misprints and various readings, bibliography and glossary, Mr. Rollins has added forty pages of notes. These, the result of a wide reading in a field in which he is thoroughly at home, are valuable, and will be of distinct service to every student of mediæval and Elizabethan literature. One suggestion may be offered. On the tune of *Green Sleeves,* twice referred to by Shakspere (*Merry Wives,* II, i, 64; V, v, 22), it is worth while to call attention to Sidney Lanier's delightful comments in his too little known essay on music in Shakspere (cf. *S. and his Forerunners,* N. Y., 1908, II, 27).

The format of the book is admirable. The volume is sure to find its way into many a private library.

E. P. K.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

RECENT PUBLICATIONS

ENGLISH

Baker, H. P.—A New View and Life of Shakespeare. *London:* Danegeld House, 1924.

Belloc, H.—The Aftermath and Lambkin's Remains. *New York:* E. P. Dutton & Co., 1923.

Beresford, John.—The Poems of Charles Cotton. *New York:* Boni and Liveright, 1923. $4.00.

Brown, Carleton.—Religious Lyrics of the XIVth Century. *New York:* Oxford Univ. Press, 1924. $3.50.

Bruce, James Douglas.—The Evolution of Arthurian Romance from the Beginning to the year 1300. Vol. II. *Baltimore:* Johns Hopkins University Press, 1923. $3.25.

Cazamian, Madeleine L.—Le Roman et les Idées en Angleterre. L'Influence de la science (1860-1890). Strasbourg Diss. *New York:* Oxford Press, 1923. ix + 484 pp.

Chambers, R. W. — Concerning Certain Great Teachers of the English Language. *London:* Arnold, 1924. 1 s.

Clark, Donald Lemen.—Rhetoric and Poetry in the Renaissance. *New York:* Columbia University Press, 1922.

Cooper, Lane.—The Climax. [Reprinted from *The Sewanee Review.*]

Cooper, T. P.—With Dickens in Yorkshire. *London:* B. Johnson, 1923. 2 s.

Doughty, O.—English Lyrics in the Age of Reason. *London:* O'Connor, 1923. 15 s.

Dudok, Gerard.—Sir Thomas More and His Utopia. *Amsterdam:* A. H. Kruyt, 1923.

Fehr, Bernard.—Die Englische Literatur des 19. u. 20. Jahrhunderts. [Handbuch d. Literatur-wissenschaft. Lfg. 1.] *Berlin-Neubabelsberg:* Academ. Verlagsgesellschaft Athenaion, 1923. M. 2.20.

Gingerich, Solomon Francis. — Selected Poems of William Wordsworth. *Boston:* Houghton Mifflin Company, 1923. $.90.

Glachant, V.—Etude sur Rudyard Kipling. *Paris:* Libr. de France, 1923. F. 4.50.

Gorman, Herbert S.—The Procession of Masks. *Boston:* B. J. Brimmer Co., 1923. $2.00.

Gosse, Edmund.—The Continuity of Literature: Presidential Address of the English Association, 1922. *Oxford and New York:* Oxford University Press, 1923.

Green, Robert. — "The Groatsworth of Witte, Bought with a Million of Repentance," and the "Repentance of Robert Greene, 1592," reprinted from old manuscripts. *New York:* E. P. Dutton and Co., 1923. $1.50.

Greg, W. W. — Two Elizabethan Stage Abridgements: The Battle of Alcazar and Orlando Furioso. An Essay in Critical Bibliography. *Oxford:* Clarendon Press, 1923.

Jespersen, Otto.—Growth and Structure of the English Language. 4 ed. revised. *Leipzig:* Teubner, 1923.

—— Logic and Grammar. [S. P. E. Tract No. XVI.] *Oxford:* Clarendon Press, 1924.

Jones, Richard Foster.—Nationalism and Imagism in Modern American Poetry. [Reprinted from *Washington University Studies*, Vol. XI.]

Kellett, E. E.—Suggestions: Literary Essays. *Cambridge:* University Press, 1923.

Liljegren, S. B. — James Harrington's 'Oceana.' Edited with notes. *Heidelberg:* Carl Winter, 1924. $2.52.

Meynell, Alice. — The School of Poetry. *New York:* Charles Scribner's Sons, 1924.

Miles, Susan. — Childhood in Verse and Prose. An Anthology. *London:* Milford, 1924.

Moore, Sir Norman. — The Book of the Foundation of St. Bartholomew's Church in London. Edited from the original manuscript in the British Museum, Cotton Vespasian B IX. E. E. T. S., Original Series, No. 163. *London:* Humphrey Milford, 1923.

Morley, Christopher.—Inward Ho! *New York:* Doubleday, Page and Co., 1923. $1.75.

Moult, Thomas. — The Best Poems of 1922. *New York:* Harcourt, Brace & Co., 1923.

Notestein, Wallace.—The Journal of Sir Simonds Dewes. *New Haven:* Yale University Press, 1923. $7.00.

Pioli, G.—P. B. Shelley. *Milan:* Corbaccio, 1923. 15 L.

Power, Eileen. — Medieval English Nunneries. *Cambridge:* University Press, 1922.

Robertson, J. G.—Studies in the Genesis of Romantic Theory in the Eighteenth Century. *Cambridge:* University Press, 1923.

Rollins, Hyder E.—An Analytical Index to the Ballad-Entries (1557-1709). *Chapel Hill:* University of North Carolina Press, 1924.

Saintsbury, George. — The Collected Essays and Papers of George Saintsbury. *New York:* E. P. Dutton and Co., 1923. $12.50.

—— A Second Scrap Book. *New York:* The Macmillan Company, 1923.

Seylaz, Louis.—Edgar Poe et les Premiers Symbolistes Français. *Lausanne:* Imprimerie la Concorde, 1924.

Sim, Frances M.—Robert Browning. *New York:* D. Appleton and Co., 1924.

Sisson, C. J.—Le goût public et le théâtre Elisabethain jusqu'à la mort de Shakespeare. *Dijon:* Impr. Darantière, 1923.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

Smith, G. C. Moore.—The Poems, English and Latin, of Edward, Lord Herbert of Cherbury. *Oxford and New York:* Clarendon Press, 1923. $4.20.

S. P. E. Tract No. XV.—The Split Infinitive, etc., by H. W. Fowler; Pictorial, Picturesque, etc., by Robert Bridges. *New York:* Oxford University Press, 1923.

Speare, Morris Edmund. — The Political Novel, its Development in 19th Century England, from Robert Plumer Ward to Mr. H. G. Wells. Dissertation. *Baltimore:* Johns Hopkins Press, 1924.

Swinnerton, Frank. — R. L. Stevenson. *New York:* George H. Doran Co., 1923. $2.00.

—— George Gissing. *New York:* George H. Doran Company, 1923. $2.00.

Tupper, Frederick and Ogle, Marbury Bladen.—Master Walter Map's Book, "De Nugis Curialium." Translated into English. *London:* Chatto and Windus, 1924.

Welby, T. Earle.—A Popular History of English Poetry. *London:* Philpott, 1924.

Whitridge, Arnold.—Unpublished Letters of Matthew Arnold. *New Haven:* Yale University Press, 1924. 6 s. 6 d.

Wilson, Sir James.—The Dialect of Robert Burns As Spoken in Central Ayrshire. *New York:* Oxford University Press, 1924.

Wyld, Henry Cecil.—Studies in English Rhymes from Surrey to Pope. A Chapter in the History of English. *London:* Murray, 1923. 140 pp. 5 sh.

GERMAN

Alpers, Paul.—Die alten niederdd. Volkslieder. Ges. u. m. Anm. hrsg. *Hamburg:* Quickborn-Verl. 1924. 260 pp. M. 3.50.

Becker, Albert.—Goethe und Zweibrücken. Ein Beitr. zur Pfälzer Geistesgeschichte. [Beitr. zur Heimatkunde der Pfalz. 6.] *Kaiserslautern:* H. Kayser, 1923. 80 pp.

Behaghel, Otto. — Die deutsche Sprache. Neue Auflage. [Das Wissen der Gegenwart. 54.] *Leipzig:* G. Freytag, 1923. 403 pp. M. 5.

Bülow, Paul.—Friedrich Lienhard. Der Mensch und das Werk. Mit vielen ungedr. u. seltenen Proben s. Dichtung. *Leipzig:* Max Koch [1923]. 472 pp. M. 12.

Dieterich, J. R.—Der Dichter des Nibelungenliedes. Ein Versuch [Jahresgabe d. Gesellschaft Hessischer Bücherfreunde, 6.]. *Darmstadt:* 1923. iv + 95 pp.

Fischer, Karl R.—Doktor Kittel, der nordböhmische Faust in Sage und Geschichte. *Gablonz a. N.:* F. Lutz, 1924. 53 pp. Kč. 9.—

Greiner, Wilh.—Goethe auf der Wartburg und in Eisenach. *Eisenach:* H. H. Bickhardt [1923]. 62 pp.

Grillparzer.—Der arme Spielmann. Erinnerungen an Beethoven. [Cambridge Plain Texts]. *Cambridge:* University Press, 1923. vi + 73 pp.

Houben, H. H.—Verbotene Literatur von der klassischen Zeit bis zur Gegenwart. [Bd. 1.] *Berlin:* Rowohlt, 1924. 618 pp. M. 20.

Hümpfner, Winfried.—Clemens Brentanos Glaubwürdigkeit in seinen Emmerick-Aufzeichnungen. Untersuchung über die Brentano-Emmerich-Frage unter erstmaliger Benutzung d. Tagebücher Brentanos. *Würzburg:* St. Rita-Verlag, 1923. xi + 574 pp.

Jungbauer, Gustav. — Die Rübezahlsage. *Reichenberg:* F. Kraus, 1923. 48 pp. Kč. 5.60.

Köster, Albert.—Gottfried Keller. 7 Vorlesungen. 4. Aufl. *Leipzig:* Teubner, 1923. iv + 154 pp. Boards, M. 2.60.

Kupferschmid, Werner.—Ueber den Wortschatz der Berner Parzival-Handschrift [Sprache u. Dichtung. H. 27]. *Bern:* P. Haupt, 1923. 185 pp.

Lamprecht.—Die Werke des Pfaffen Lamprecht nach d. ältesten Überlieferung hrsg. v. H. E. Müller. [Münchener Texte, H. 12.] *München:* Callwey, 1923. xxviii + 73 pp. M. 1.

Leyen, Friedr. v. d.—Die deutschen Heldensagen. 2. völlig neubearb. Aufl. [Deutsches Sagenbuch. Tl. 2.]. *München:* Beck, 1923. viii + 337 pp. M. 4.50.

Manuel, Carl.—Jeremias Gotthelf. Leben und Schriften. *München:* Rentsch [1923]. 172 pp., boards, M. 2.

Meyer-Benfey, Heinr.—Kleist. [Aus Natur u. Geisteswelt. 567]. *Leipzig:* Teubner, 1923. 126 pp. M. 1.30.

Oehlke, Waldemar.—Geschichte der deutschen Literatur. 2. Aufl. *Bielefeld:* Velhagen & Klasing, 1923. viii + 442 pp. Bound, M. 15.

Schopenhauer, Johanna.—Damals in Weimar! Erinnerungen u. Briefe von u. an Johanna Schopenhauer. Hrsg. v. H. H. Houben. *Leipzig:* Klinkhardt & Biermann, 1924. viii + 358 pp. Bound, M. 10.

Stammler, Wolfgang.—Deutsche Literatur vom Naturalismus bis zur Gegenwart. [Jedermanns Bücherei]. *Breslau:* Ferd. Hirt, 1924. 144 pp. Bound, M. 2.50.

Steiner, Rudolf. — Grundlinien einer Erkenntnistheorie der Goetheschen Weltanschauung mit bes. Rücksicht auf Schiller. Zugl. eine Zugabe zu Goethes "Naturwiss. Schriften" in Kürschners Deu. Nat.-Lit. Neue . . . erw. Aufl. [Philos.-anthroposoph. Bibl.] *Stuttgart:* Der Kommende Tag [1924]. xiii + 112 pp. M. 2.50.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

Sütterlin, Ludwig. — Neuhochdeutsche Grammatik, mit bes. Berücks. d. neuhochdeutschen Mundarten. Hälfte 1. [Handb. d. dt. Unterr. an höh. Schulen. Bd. 2, Tl. 2.] *München:* Beck, 1924. 4°. xxii + 504 pp. Cloth, M. 14.50.

Tengler, Richard.—Schopenhauer und die Romantik. [Germanische Studien. H. 29.] *Berlin:* Ebering, 1923. 96 pp. M. 2.80.

Witkop, Philipp. — Deutsche Dichtung der Gegenwart. *Leipzig:* Haessel, 1924. 208 pp. M. 3.20.

Zink, Theodor. — Pfälzische Flurnamen. Gesammelt u. erläutert. [Beiträge z. Landeskunde d. Rheinpfalz, H. 4.] *Kaiserslautern:* H. Kayser, 1923. 184 p.

Zirker, Otto.—Die Bereicherung des deutschen Wortschatzes durch die spätmittelalterliche Mystik. [Jenaer germanist. Forsch. 3.] *Jena:* Frommann, 1923. vii + 98 pp. M. 3.50.

FRENCH

Arnavon, J.—Notes sur l'interprétation de Molière. *Paris:* Plon-Nourrit, 1923. iv + 411 pp. Fr. 20.

Axelsen, A.—Supernatural Beings in the French Medieval Dramas. *Copenhagen:* Levin and Munksgaard, 1923.

Bowler, M. E.—Stories by contemporary French novelists. *New York:* Ginn, 1924. xi + 192 pp. 76 cts.

Brieux, E.—Blanchette, ed. by Hugh A. Smith and H. M. Langer. *Boston:* Heath, 1924. xxi + 104 pp. 92 cts.

Brockstedt, G.—Benoit de Sainte-Maure u. seine Quellen. *Kiel:* Cordes, 1923. 238 pp.

Brügger, Alice.—Les noms du roitelet en France. Diss. *Zurich:* 1923.

Catalogue général des livres imprimés de la Bibl. nat. T. 77. Jany-Jerzykowski. *Paris:* Impr. nat., 1923. 1292 pp.

Cheney, G. H.—French idioms and phrases. *Boston:* Ginn (1923). 79 pp. 76 cts.

Clouard, H.—La Poésie fr. mod., des romantiques à nos jours. *Paris:* Gauthier-Villars, 1923. vi + 404 pp.

Constant, B.—Adolphe et Œuvres choisies, éd. par M. Allem. *Paris:* Larousse, 1923. 248 pp.

Coulon, M. — Le Problème de Rimbaud. *Paris:* Gomès, 1923. xii + 312 pp. Fr. 10.

Dawson, J. C.—Toulouse in the Renaissance. Diss. *New York:* Columbia Univ. Press, 1923. 201 pp. $1.75.

Dimock, E.—Monsieur et madame (beginner's French). *New York:* Harper, 1924. 142 pp. $2.

Dondo and Perley.—French fairy plays. *New York:* Oxford Press, 1923. 170 pp. 95 cts.

Du Bled, V.—La Soc. fr. depuis cent ans. Quelques salons du second empire. *Paris:* Bloud et Gay, 1923. xxxi + 244 pp.

Fille du comte de Ponthieu, la, ed. by C. Brunel. *Paris:* Champion, 1923. lxxv + 165 pp. (Soc. des anc. textes fr.).

Fourcassié, J.—Memento d'hist. de la litt. fr. *Paris:* Belin, 1923. 137 pp. Fr. 3.

Glatigny, A.—Lettres à Th. de Banville, publ. par G. Chastel. *Paris:* Mercure de France, 1923. 109 pp. Fr. 12.

Guérard, A. L.—Reflections on the Napoleonic legend. *New York:* Scribner, 1924. 276 pp. $3.75.

Hugo, V.—Les Misérables, ed. by L. and A. Cardon. *New York:* Scribner, 1923. 246 pp. 88 cts.

Ibrovac, M.—José Maria de Heredia. Sa vie. Son œuvre. Diss. *Paris:* Presses univ., 1923. xii + 646 pp.

—— Les Sources des Trophées. Diss. *Paris:* Presses univ., 1923. viii + 190 pp.

Latham, E.—French and English dictionary. *New York:* Dutton, (1923). 275 pp. 70 cts.

Lepeletier, E.—P. Verlaine. Sa vie. Son œuvre. *Paris:* Mercure de France, 1923. 562 pp. Fr. 15.

Liederhandschrift, Die, des Kardinals de Rohan (XV. Jahrh.) . . . hrsg. v. X. M. Löpelmann (Ges. f. rom. Lit. Bd. 44). *Halle:* Niemeyer, 1923. xxii + 428 pp.

Lorck, E. — Die "Erlebte Rede." Eine sprachliche Untersuchung. *Heidelberg:* Winter, 1923. 79 pp.

Marchand, Ch. M. and Warren, E. F.—Advanced French Grammar. *New York:* Brentano's, 1923. xii + 448 pp.

Moncrieff, C. K. S.—Marcel Proust, an English tribute (by Conrad, Bennett, Symons, etc.). *New York:* Seltzer, 1923. 153 pp. $1.75.

Paganelli, D.—Un petit fils de Renan, Ernest Psichari. *Saint-Raphaël:* Eds. des Tablettes, 1923. 88 pp.

Pascal.—Les Pensées, éd. par A. Espiard. *Paris:* Larousse, 1923. 2 vols. 204 + 224 pp.

Pellegrini, C.—Eugenio Fromentin scrittore. *Ferrara:* Soc. tip. ed. Taddei, 1922. 197 pp. L. 10.

Pinloche, A.—Vocabulaire par l'image de la langue fr. *Paris:* Larousse, 1923. v + 383 pp. 193 planches.

Poidevin, F.—Les Œuvres, ed. by G. Dufossé. *Rue (Somme):* Dumont, 1920. xiv + 472 pp.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

Schwan-Behrens. — Grammaire de l'anc. français. Trad. frçse. par O. Bloch. 1/2. Phonétique et morphologie. 3/. Matériaux . . . pour l'étude des Dialectes. 3me ed., d'après la 11me ed. allemande. *Leipzig:* Reisland, 1923.

Siegfried, Alfred.—Lautlehre der Mundart von Court (Berner Jura). Diss. Basle. 53 pp.

Storer, W. H.—Virgil and Ronsard. Illinois Diss. *Paris:* Champion, 1923. xx + 143 pp.

Tacconi, I.—Un poeta dei paria: Jehan Rictus. Saggio critico. *Zara:* Tip. E. de Schönfeld, 1923. 47 pp.

Villon, François.—Le poesie. Commento di F. Neri. *Torino:* G. Chiantore, 1923. xxxii + 208 pp. L. 16. (Scrittori di Francia, I.)

ITALIAN

Angeloni, E.—Somiglianze—in gran parte accidentali—di similitudini, di imagini e di pensieri del Manzoni a similitudini, imagini e pensieri di altri grandi intelletti. *Aquila:* Tip. Vecchioni, 1923. 59 pp.

Ballerini, E.—Umorismo paesano. Traduzioni in italiano da poesie dialettali, per —. *Torino:* A. Giani, 1923. 287 pp. L. 10.

Bartolo, F. De.—Dante. Conferenza. *Trani:* Ditta tip. Vecchi e C., 1922. 20 pp.

Basinio. — Le poesie liriche (Isottaeus, Cyris, Varia). A cura di F. Ferri. *Torino:* G. Chiantorre, 1923. (Testi latini umanistici, direttore R. Sabbadini, I.)

Bazzi-Aimini, G.—Canti della patria, scelti da —, e pubblicati a cura de "Il Tricolore," 1831-1923. *Milano:* A. Cordani, 1923. 177 pp. L. 20.

Benedetto, L. Di.—Coi rimatori dello stil novo. *Chieti:* Tip. del Popolo, 1923. 32 pp.

Bertolini, Noemi. — L'italianità nel linguaggio sportivo. *Bergamo:* Tip. ed. Secomandi, 1923. 75 pp.

Bianchi, A. G.—Giovanni Pascoli nei ricordi di un amico. *Milano:* Casa ed. La Modernissima, 1923. 101 pp. L. 7.

Bindoni, G.—La topografia del romanzo "I promessi sposi." Seconda edizione, rifatta e raccolta in un solo volume. *Milano:* A. Vallardi, 1923. 195 pp. L. 12.

Biondolillo, F. — L'unità spirituale nella Divina Commedia. *Messina:* Principato, 1923. L. 10.

Borzelli, A.—Torquato Tasso a Napoli nel 1592 in casa del principe di Conca. *Napoli:* Ved. Ceccoli e F., 1923. 60 pp.

Boza Masvidal, A. A.—El Dante. Su influencia en la literatura castellana. Ensayo crítico-literario. *Habana:* Imp. "El Siglo XX," 1920. 37 pp.

Bruno, Giordano.—Candelaio. Commedia. Seconda edizione, riveduta e migliorata, con testo critico, introduzione, note e documenti, a cura di V. Spampanato. *Bari:* G. Laterza e figli, 1923. lxxi + 227 pp. L. 24. (Opere italiane di Giordano Bruno, III.)

Carducci, G.—Primi saggi. *Bologna:* Zanichelli, 1922. 509 pp. L. 10.

Donadoni, E.—Il canto XV del Paradiso, letto nella sala di Dante in Orsanmichele il dì 22 aprile 1923. *Firenze:* G. C. Sansoni, 1923. 40 pp. L. 3. (Lectura Dantis.)

Ferri, C.—Sonetto inedito, a cura di A. Mabellini. *Fano:* Tip. Letteraria, 1922. 8 pp. (Per nozze Lancellotti Borgogelli-Ottaviani.)

Fornaciari, Raffaello.—Alcune lettere giovanili alla famiglia, pubblicate a cura del nipote Antonio Gigli. *Firenze:* Tip. Barbèra, 1923. 17 pp. (Per le nozze Gigli-Rossi.)

Francesco, Santo.—I Fioretti di —, a cura di A. Della Torre. *Torino:* Paravia, 1922. lvi + 285 pp. L. 8.

Giacosa, P.—Il canto XXV del Purgatorio. *Firenze:* G. C. Sansoni, 1922. 33 pp. L. 3. (Lectura Dantis.)

Goldoni, C.—Commedie scelte, pubblicate per cura di R. Nocchi. *Firenze:* Le Monnier, 1923. xxxi + 487 pp. L. 7.50. (Nuova biblioteca nazionale.)

Guerrieri, R.—Il laudario lirico della confraternita di santa Maria dei Raccomandati in Gualdo Tadino. *Perugia:* Unione tipografica cooperativa, 1923. 51 pp.

Intravaja, I.—La poesia di Giovanni Gioviano Pontano. *Palermo:* G. Priulla, 1923. 126 pp. L. 8.

Leopardi, Giacomo.—Pensieri di varia filosofia e di bella letteratura. Vol. IV. *Firenze:* F. Le Monnier, 1923. 439 pp. L. 10.

Machiavelli, N.—Belfagor arcidiavolo; La Mandragola; Vita di Castruccio. *Milano:* A. Facchi, 1922. 190 pp. L. 1.95. (L'ideale: collezione dei libri più letti, no. 6.)

Mancinelli, N. — Pietro Summonte umanista napoletano. *Roma:* Tip. Camera dei Deputati, 1923. 95 pp.

Manzoni, A.—I promessi sposi. Storia milanese del secolo XVII. *Sancasciano-Pesa:* Soc. ed. Toscana, 1923. 660 pp. L. 5.

——— Tragedie. *Milano:* A. Facchi, 1922. 192 pp. L. 1.95. (L'ideale: collezione dei libri più letti, no. 8.)

Mari, A. — Ricordando Giovanni Pascoli, maestro dell'Ateneo messinese. *Messina:* Tip. ditta D'Amico, 1923. viii + 23 pp. L. 2. (Biblioteca della società messinese di storia patria n. 1.)

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

Marino, G. B.—L'Adone. A cura di G. Balsamo Crivelli. *Torino:* Paravia, 1923. L. 24.

Mascialino, F.—Il poeta del "Carme d'amore" (Pietro Cornacchiari). *Brescia:* Fratelli Lamperti, 1923. 24 pp.

Massaroli, N.—La segaveghia in Romagna o il supplizio in un innocente. I canti della culla nella romagnola (Ninne-nanne). I saluti (canti popolari romagnoli). *Faenza:* Tip. F. Lega, 1922. 36 pp. L. 2. (Tradizioni popolari in Romagna. Biblioteca de "La Piè," no. 5.)

Mazzoni, F.—Il paesaggio nella letteratura del quattrocento. Saggio. *Roma:* Tip. delle Mantellate, 1923. 27 pp.

Morici, G. — Il canto III del Paradiso, letto nella sala di Dante in Orsanmichele il dì 20 aprile 1922. *Firenze:* G. C. Sansoni, 1923. 43 pp. L. 3. (Lectura Dantis.)

Parodi, E. G.—Poeti antichi e moderni. Studi critici. *Firenze:* Sansoni, 1923.

Petraccone, E.—Cagliostro nella storia e nella leggenda. *Palermo:* R. Sandron, 1922. iv + 265 pp. L. 12.50.

Pietrobono, L.—Il canto XXIX del Purgatorio. *Firenze:* G. C. Sansoni, 1922. 31 pp. L. 3. (Lectura Dantis.)

Pistelli, E.—Il canto XIV del Purgatorio, letto nella sala di Dante in Orsanmichele. *Firenze:* G. C. Sansoni, 1922. 36 pp. L. 3. (Lectura Dantis.)

Prati, Giovanni.—Per —, nell'occasione del trasporto della sua salma da Torino a Dasindo, 30 giugno-1 luglio 1923. *Trento:* Tip. Scotoni e Vitti, 1923. 21 pp.

Puccio, Maria Anna.—Il realismo nella letteratura infantile. *Palermo:* Industrie riunite ed. Siciliane, 1923. 22 pp. L. 2.50.

Rigillo, M.—Manzoni intimo. *Piacenza:* Stab. tip. Piacentino, 1923. 33 pp.

Rio, P.—La reazione al secentismo nell'opera satirica di Salvatore Rosa. *Siracusa:* Tip. S. Santoro Gubernale, 1923. 48 pp.

Strinati, E. — Alla ricerca della poesia. *Roma:* Grafia, S. A. I. industrie grafiche, 1922. 31 pp.

Turchi, D. A.—Il Carme alle stelle di Domenico Giura. *Campobasso:* Casa tip. ed. G. Colitti e figlio, 1922. 29 pp. L. 2.50. (Collana Colitti di conferenze e discorsi, no. 64.)

Vannutelli, Evelina. — Influenza del Petrarca sui poeti castigliani del secolo XV. Note introduttive. *Pavia:* Scuola tip. Artigianelli, 1923. 15 pp.

Wilkins, E. H.—The Pronunciation of the Names of Italian Painters. *Chicago, Ill.:* The University of Chicago Press, 1920. 13 pp. 25 cts.

SPANISH

Alarcón, P. A. de.—Auswahl aus seinen Novelas Cortas. Mit erkl. Anm. hrsg. von Richard Ruppert y Ujaravi. *Heidelberg:* Julius Groos, 1922. xi + 108 pp. Gz. M. 1.80. (Neuere spanische Schriftsteller, 1.)

Alonso Cortés, N.—El teatro en Valladolid. *Madrid:* Tipografía de la "Revista de Archivos," 1923. 431 pp.

—— Literatura elemental. *Valladolid:* Talleres tipográficos "Cuesta," 1923. 319 pp.

Ayala, J. R.—La literatura modernista, buena o mala, es la adecuada a nuestros días, porque es espejo de las ideas y de las costumbres de la época. *Caracas:* Lib. del Comercio, 1923. 64 pp. (Discurso leído ante la Academia Venezolana, el 18 de febrero de 1923.)

Coloma, L.—Boy. *Freiburg:* Herder, 1922. 346 pp.

Cueva, M. de la.—Libro de pensamientos, máximas y consejos al alcance de la inteligencia de los niños, entresacados de las obras de Cervantes, por —. *Madrid:* Renacimiento, 1916. 112 pp.

Leavitt, S. E.—Argentine Literature. A bibliography of literary criticism, biography, and literary controversy. *Chapel Hill, N. C.:* The University of North Carolina Press, 1924. 92 pp. $1.50. (University of North Carolina Studies in Language and Literature, 1.)

Lope de Vega.—Comedias. Edición y notas de J. Gómez Ocerín y R. M. Tenneiro. I. *Madrid:* Ediciones de "La Lectura," 1922. 5 pes.

—— La Corona merecida. Publicada por J. F. Montesinos. *Madrid:* Junta para ampliación de estudios e investigaciones científicas. Centro de estudios históricos, 1923. 215 pp. 6 pes. (Teatro antiguo español. Textos y estudios, V.)

Madariaga, S. de.—The Genius of Spain, and other essays on Spanish contemporary literature. *New York:* Oxford University Press, 1923. 164 pp. $3.35.

Peers, E. A.—Rivas and Romanticism in Spain. *London:* Hodder and Stoughton, 1923. xviii + 132 pp. 6 sh.

Ribadeneira, Petri de.—Confessiones, epistolae aliaque scripta inedita ex autographis antiquissimis, apographis et regestis deprompta. Tomus secundus. *Matriti:* Editorial Ibérica, 1923. viii + 552 pp. 20 pes. (Monumenta Historica Societatis Jesu a patribus ejusdem societatis edita.)

Romera-Navarro, M.—Historia de España. *Nueva York:* D. C. Heath y Compañía, 1923. xi + 302 pp. $1.40.

Schuchardt, H.—Primitiae linguae Vasconum. Einführung ins Baskische. *Halle*

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

(*Saale*): M. Niemeyer, 1923. viii + 33 pp. 70 cts.

Wacker, G. — Spanische Grammatik für höhere Schulen. Formenlehre. *Leipzig:* Teubner, 1922. 60 pp.

Withers, A. M.—The Sources of the Poetry of Gutierre de Cetina. *Philadelphia, Pa.:* The University of Pennsylvania, 1923. 91 pp. $1.50. (Publications of the University of Pennsylvania. Series in Romanic Languages and Literatures, No. 9.)

PORTUGUESE

Almeida Cavacas, A. de.—A lingua portuguesa e sua metafonia. *Coimbra:* 1922. 190 pp.

Antica lirica portoghese. *Roma:* Maglione e Strini, 1922. 48 pp. L. 6.50. (Testi romanzi per uso delle scuole, a cura di C. De Lollis, no. 4.)

Bell, A. F. G.—Portuguese Bibliography. *New York:* Oxford University Press, 1922. 381 pp. $4.20. (Hispanic Notes and Monographs. Essays, Studies, and Brief Biographies Issued by The Hispanic Society of America. Bibliography Series, I.)

Bernardes. — Nova Floresta. I. *Paris-Lisboa:* Libr. Aillaud et Bertrand, 1922. xli + 274 pp. (Antologia portuguesa, organizada por A. de Campos.)

—— Nova Floresta. II. Estimulo pratico. Luz e Calor. Ultimos fins do Homem. Exercicios espirituals, etc. *Paris-Lisboa:* Libr. Aillaud et Bertrand, 1922. liv + 273 pp. (Antologia portuguesa, organizada por A. de Campos.)

Braamcamp Freire, A. — A Censura e o Cancionero geral. *Coimbra:* 1922. 70 pp.

Cardim, L.—Some Notes on the Portuguese - English and English - Portuguese Grammars to 1830. *Porto:* Tipografia de "A Tribuna," 1922. 15 pp. (Repr. fr. the "Revista da Faculdade de Letras da Universidade do Porto," 1922, nos. 5-6.)

Coímbra, L.—Guerra Junqueiro. *Pôrto:* Edição de A "Renascença Portuguesa," 1923. 155 pp.

Dalgado Sebastião, R.—Glossario luso-asiâtico. Volume II: mabada-zuranti. *Coimbra:* Impr. da Universidade, 1921. 4to., 580 pp. (Academia das Sciências de Lisboa.)

Fernão Lopes.—I. Cronicas de D. Pedro e D. Fernando. *Paris-Lisboa:* Libr. Aillaud et Bertrand, 1922. lxxvi + 278 pp. (Antologia portuguesa, organizada por A. de Campos.)

Junqueiro.—Verso e prosa. *Paris-Lisboa:* Libr. Aillaud et Bertrand, 1922. lxxviii + 258 pp. (Antologia portuguesa, organizada por A. de Campos.)

Michaelis de Vasconcellos, Carolina. — Glossario do Cancioneiro da Ajuda. *Lisboa:* Livraria Classica, 1923. 106 pp. (Repr. fr. "Revista Lusitana," XXIII.)

Moreira, J. — Estudos da lingua portuguesa. Subsidios para a sintaxe historica popular. *Lisboa:* Livraria classica, 1923. 2 vols.

Nunes, J. J.—Nomes de pessoas da toponimia portuguesa. *Coimbra:* 1922. 20 pp.

—— Vida e milagres de Dona Isabel Rainha de Portugal. Texto de século XIV, restituido à sua presumivel forma primitiva e acompanhado de notas explicativas. *Lisboa:* Livraria classica, 1923.

Paladinos da linguagem. *Paris-Lisboa:* Libr. Aillaud et Bertrand, 1922. lxiv + 269 pp. (Antologia portuguesa, organizada por A. de Campos.)

Parlagreco, C.—Dizionario portoghese-italiano e italiano-portoghese. *Milano:* A. Vallardi, 1922. viii + 528 pp.

Taunay, A. d'E.—Innocencia. Edited with introduction, notes and vocabulary, by M. B. Jones. *Boston:* D. C. Heath & Co., 1923. xxiii + 196 pp. $1.20.

Trancoso.—Histórias de proveito e exemplo. Introdução de A. de C. *Lisboa:* "Diario de Noticias," 1922. lix + 274 pp. (Antologia Portuguesa.)

GENERAL

Brenot, A.—Les Fables de Phèdre. Thèse compl. *Paris:* Soc. d'édition, 1923. xvi + 121 pp.

Cooper, Lane.—The Poetics of Aristotle, its Meaning and Influence. [Our Debt to Greece and Rome.] *Boston:* Marshall Jones Co., 1924.

Ernst, Fritz.—Der Klassizismus in Italien, Frankreich, und Deutschland. *Wien:* Amalthea-Verlag, 1924. 153 pp. Kr. 25000.

Farinelli, A.—Il sogno di una letteratura mondiale. *Roma:* Fondazione Leonardo per la cultura italiana, 1923. 32 pp. L. 1.50. (Conferenze della Leonardo.)

Harrington, Karl Pomeroy.—Catullus and his Influence. [Our Debt to Greece and Rome.] *Boston:* Marshall Jones Co., 1924.

Kent, Roland G.—Language and Philology. [Our Debt to Greece and Rome.] *Boston:* Marshall Jones Co., 1924.

Lucas, F. L.—Euripides and his Influence [Our Debt to Greece and Rome.] *Boston:* Marshall Jones Co., 1924.

Taylor, Archer.—The Burning of Judas. [Repr. from Washington Univ. Studies, Vol. XI, Humanistic Series, No. 1, pp. 159-186.] 1923.

Zedler, Gottfried.—Die neuere Gutenbergforschung und die Lösung der Costerfrage. *Frankfurt a. M.:* Baer & Co., 1923. 63 pp. M. 1.50.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

Volume XXXIX MAY, 1924 Number 5

MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES

EDITED BY

JAMES WILSON BRIGHT, Editor-in-Chief

GUSTAV GRUENBAUM WILLIAM KURRELMEYER

H. CARRINGTON LANCASTER

CONTENTS

WELLS, W. H.—Chaucer as a Literary Critic,

FICHTER, W. L.—Notes on the Chronology of Lope de Vega's 'Comedias' 268

BROOKS, N. C.—Notes on Performances of French Mystery Plays, - - 276

FESS, G. M.—Meléndez Valdés' 'Vanidad de las Quejas del Hombre contra su Hacedor' and the 'Pensées' of Pascal, - - - - - 28

GREENE, G. S.—A new Date for George Wilkins's 'Three Miseries of Barbary,' - - - - - - - - - - - 28

Reviews:—

CHAUNCEY B. TINKER, Nature's Simple Plan. [*R. S. Crane*] - - 29

LEOPOLD LACOUR, Les premières actrices françaises. [*H. C. Lancaster.*] 29

O. E. LESSING, Geschichte der deutschen Literatur in ihren Grundzügen. [*E. H. Zeydel.*] - - - - - - - - - - 30

PIERRE DE BACOURT and J. W. CUNLIFFE, French Literature during the Last Half-Century. [*G. Chinard.*] - - - - - 30

Correspondence:—

PARRY, J. J., An Arthurian Parallel, - - - - - - - 307

BULLOCK, W. L., Some Notes to a Note, - - - - - - - 309

CAMPBELL, T. M., A Correction, - - - - - - - - 311

PECK, W. E., On the Origin of the Shelley Society (Postscript), - 312

Brief Mention:—

JOHANNES BOLTE, Johannes Pauli's *Schimpf und Ernst*;—GUSTAVE RUDLER, Les techniques de la critique et de l'histoire littéraires en littérature française moderne;—H. J. CHAYTOR, The Troubadours and England, - - - - - - - - - - - - - - 314

THE JOHNS HOPKINS PRESS

BALTIMORE

Eight Numbers a Year—Single Copy (Current) Sixty-five Cents

Entered as Second-Class Matter at the Baltimore, Maryland, Postoffice

Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103, Act of October 3, 1917. Authorized on July 3, 1918.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES

A MONTHLY PUBLICATION with intermission from July to October (inclusive)

This publication is devoted to linguistic and literary research and to [a]esthetic and philosophic criticism in the domain of English, German, and [th]e related Germanic Languages; and of French, Italian, Spanish, and the [oth]er Languages of the Romance Group. Its purpose is also to promote [a]nd methods in the teaching of the Modern Languages and Literatures.

The Subscription Price of the current annual volume is $5.00 for the United States and Mexico; Canada $5.25 and $5.50 for other countries included in the Postal Union.

[Contri]butors and Publishers will please address matter for the English Department [to] James W. Bright; for the German Department to William Kurrelmeyer; [Fren]ch Department to H. Carrington Lancaster; for the Italian and Spanish [t]o Gustav Gruenbaum. Other matter may be sent to the Editor-in-Chief. [address of] all the editors is Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md. [Sub]scriptions and other business communications should be sent to the Johns Hopkins [Press, B]altimore, Md.

PREPARATION OF COPY

[All] copy should be in typewritten form.
[Und]erscore (for italics) all titles of books, periodicals, poems, plays and other [separate]ly published compositions.
[Use] numerals in designating foot-notes, and number foot-notes in unbroken sequence.
[Use] roman numerals for volume-reference, set off by a comma before a following page-[referenc]e.

OXFORD JUNIOR GERMAN SERIES

[Un]der the general editorship of Rev. W. H. DAVID with Questionnaire, Direct Method Exercises and short Notes in German. With or without German-English Vocabulary. 70c. each.

In the Oxford Junior German Series there is unity of treatment in the Questionnaires, [Gra]mmatical Exercises, Notes and Vocabularies and both Questionnaires and Grammatical [Exe]rcises have been framed on simple lines, designed to elicit prompt and unstudied answers.

A NEW ADDITION

[Di]e Regentrude und andere Erzählungen von Theodor Storm. Herausgegeben von Elisabeth Joachim.

PREVIOUSLY PUBLISHED

[Das] grüne Haus, by Dehmel. Edited by C. R. Ash.
[Ed]egar der Hirtenschüler, by Villinger. Edited by C. W. Merryweather.
[Till] Eulenspiegel, nach der Bearbeitung von Karl Simrock, edited by M. L. Seebohm.
[Kr]ingelt, Der Richtungspunkt, zwei Kriegsnovellen, by Liliencron. Edited by A. M. D. Hughes.
[Wol]fdieterich, by Klaussmann. Edited by H. E. Adams.
[Der] Geisterseher von Friedrich von Schiller herausgegeben von H. A. Cotton.
[Der] Onkel aus Pommern, Zwei Humoresken, by Ernst von Wildenbruch, herausgegeben von Karl Wichmann.
[Sie]gfried, nach Schalk's Deutschen Heldensagen, adapted and edited by A. E. Wilson and A. Meyrick.
[Rol]and und Beowulf: Zwei Heldengeschichten, edited by H. E. G. Tyndale.

OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS

American Branch

35 WEST 32ND STREET, NEW YORK

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES

VOLUME XXXIX — MAY, 1924 — NUMBER 5

CHAUCER AS A LITERARY CRITIC

Chaucer's consideration of himself as the author of his works and his conscious responsibility for their matter and technique are aspects of his poetry that have received a long neglect at the hands of critics. Mention of the poems in the Prologue to *The Legend of Good Women*,[1] the Man of Law's Prologue,[2] and the Apology and the Retraction,[3] is in itself sufficient indication of some such self-consciousness; yet, with the exception of very few scholars,[4] this point of view has been entirely lost sight of. To one reading the poems at all closely, much evidence stands forth; for Chaucer gives specific criticism, not only of his own work, but of that of his contemporaries and of the classical writers as well. Also, throughout the poems one may trace definite ideas regarding narrative technique and style.

To point out these criticisms and ideas is the purpose of this article, avoiding, for the sake of brevity, all but the main implications. Accordingly, no attempt will be made to ally Chaucer with his contemporaries, or to show the indebtedness of his ideas to any of the writers before his time. By itself, his testimony constructs a Minos' maze sufficient for the present page.

[1] *L.*, 254, 414.

[2] *B.*, 46 ff.

[3] *I.*, 1084 ff.

[4] Miss Hammond in her *Chaucer, A Bibliographical Manual*, N. Y., 1908, pp. 158, 259, 261, calls attention to this neglect. Courthope, *History of English Poetry*, N. Y., 1895, vol. I, pp. 259-260, Saintsbury, *History of Criticism*, London, 1900, vol. I, pp. 450-451, and Manly, *Mod. Phil.*, VIII, pp. 141 ff., adopt the attitude in connection with the *Sir Thopas*, as Professor Hart does to some extent in discussing the *Franklin's Tale*, *Haver-Essays*, Haverford, 1909, p. 185 ff.

Digitized by Google — Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

First, his love of books becomes apparent in the earliest poems. In *The Book of the Duchess,* he tells us that

> Upon my bedde I sat upright,
> And bad oon reche me a book,
> A romaunce, and he hit me took
> To rede and dryve the night away;
> For me thoghte it better play
> Then playen either at chesse or tables.[5]

and in *The Parlement of Foules,*

> . . . . other bokes took me to
> To rede upon, and yet I rede alway.[6]

In *The House of Fame,* the eagle reminds Chaucer that after his day of labor over account books,

> Thou sittest at another boke,
> Til fully daswed is thy loke.[7]

Both for the sake of pleasure and of learning, he tells us, is this habit,[8] and becomes most definite in his Prologue to the *Legend of Good Women,*[9] claiming that the Sabbath and 'the joly time of May' are the only occasions that can ween him from those books to which he gives such faith and credence.

Despite these passages, such facts might well have been surmised from the occasional bits occurring throughout his work. There is the well-known and affectionate description of the clerk,[10] for instance, and that moment in the *Troilus* when Pandarus

> . . . . took a light, and fond his contenaunce
> As for to loke up-on an old romaunce.[11]

But books, says Chaucer, aside from giving pleasure, teach of past ages 'whyl men loved the lawe of kinde'[12] and provide the

[5] *BD.*, 46 ff.
[6] *PF.*, 695 ff.
[7] *HF.*, 657 ff.
[8] *PF.*, 15 ff.:

> Of usage, what for luste what for lore,
> On bokes rede I ofte, as I yow tolde.

[9] *L.*, 29 ff.
[10] *A.*, 293 ff.
[11] *TC.*, III, 979 ff.
[12] *BD.*, 56 ff.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

opportunities 'wher-with to scoleye.'[13] To a book he goes 'a certeyn thing to lerne,'[14] in the hope to create from its lore the thing he contemplates.

> For out of olde feldes, as men seith,
> Cometh al this newe corn fro yeer to yere;
> And out of olde bokes, in good feith,
> Cometh al this newe science that men lere.[15]

This, then, is Chaucer's employment of reading, and may well be considered the argument for his translation and use of the work of other authors.

Of these authors, themselves, Chaucer does not leave us in doubt. Vergil, Ovid, Homer, Lucan, and Statius, we may believe, constitute the select company of his highest admiration, since it is they whose steps he hopes the humble *Troilus and Criseyde* may kiss.[16] All these, too, have their pillars in the House of Fame,[17] but unfortunately the poet is sparing of pointing out just wherein he believes their excellence to consist. Accordingly, we must be content with an occasional commendatory phrase. Thus

> Glory and honour, Virgil Mantuan,
> Be to thy name! and I shal, as I can,
> Folow thy lantern, as thou gost biforn.[18]

---

[13] *L.*, 17 ff.:

> Than mote we to bokes that we finde,
> Through which that olde thinges been in minde,
> And to the doctrine of these olde wyse,
> Yeven credence, in every skilful wyse,
> And trowen on these olde approved stories
> Of holinesse, of regnes, of victories,
> Of love, of hate, of other sundry thinges,
> Of whiche I may not maken rehersinges.
> And if that olde bokes were a-weye,
> Y-loren were of remembraunce the keye.
> Wel oghte us than on olde bokes love,
> Ther-as ther is non other assay by preve.

[14] *PF.*, 20.

[15] *Ibid.*, 22 ff.

[16] *TC.*, IV, 1791 ff.

[17] *HF.*, 1456 ff.

[18] *L.*, 924 ff. The significance, in *The Hous of Fame* (ll. 1481-1485), of Homer's iron pillar becoming tinned for Vergil has been explained by Miss Elizabeth Nitchie: *Vergil and the English Poets*, N. Y. 1919; p. 59.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

Ovid is

> . . . . Venus clerk . . . .
> That hath y-sowen wonder wyde
> The grete god of Loves name,[19]

and there are compliments, too, to Ovid's tale of Ceyx and Alcyone, 'that me thoughte a wonder thing,'[20] in the *Book of the Duchess*; for

> Such sorwe this lady to her took
> That trewely I, which made this book,
> Had swich pite and swich rowthe
> To rede hir sorwe, that, by my trowthe,
> I ferde the worse al the morwe
> After, to thenken on her sorwe,[21]

a delicate tribute to Ovid's power. The same author is apostrophized as 'noble'[22] by the Merchant, and extended similar praise throughout *The Legend of Good Women.*[23] For criticism of Homer, 'the gret Omeer'[24] must suffice. Similarly, 'the grete poete'[26] is the only judgment given us concerning Lucan.

In the wake of these five, come minor lights. 'Th' Ebrayk Josephus'[27] Dares, Dictes, 'Lollius,' Guido, Geoffrey[28] ('betwix hem was a litel envye' of Homer), and Claudius[29] also have their places in the *House of Fame* with 'an othere many mo.' In this poem, too, Marcian and Aleynus are playfully lauded for the truth of their descriptions of the heavens,[30] although the former comes in for later disapproval at the tongue of the Merchant.[31] Plato is judged as 'wyse'[32] and Juvenal's verity and insight are praised in the *Troilus.*[33] Theophrastus is flouted by January in the *Merchant's Tale,*[34] but since the condemnation is twice removed from Chaucer himself, it is hardly to be accepted as evidence of his own opinion. In the *Legend of Hypsipyle,* Valerius Flaccus is

[19] *HF.*, 1487 ff.
[20] *BD.*, 61; cf. also, *Ibid.*, 221-230.
[21] *Ibid.*, 95 ff.
[22] *E.*, 2125.
[23] *L.*, 1367, 1678.
[24] *HF.*, 1466.
[25] *Ibid.*, 1499.
[27] *Ibid.*, 1433.
[28] *Ibid.*, 1467 ff.
[29] *Ibid.*, 1507 ff.
[30] *Ibid.*, 985 ff.
[31] *E.*, 1732 ff.
[32] *H.*, 207.
[33] *TC.*, IV, 197 ff.; cf. also *D.*, 1191-1192.
[34] *E.*, 1295 ff.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

rebuked for the length of the *Argonauticon* and for his insertion of extraneous matter.[35] There is a sly hit at Geoffrey de Vinsauf in the *Nun's Priest's Tale.*[36] Cicero's *Somnium Scipionis,* Chaucer tells us

> To rede forth hit gan me so delyte
> That al the day me thoughte but a lyte,[37]

and the monk adjures the pilgrims to read

> . . . . the grete poete of Itaille,
> That highte Dant, for he can al devyse
> Fro point to point, nat o word wol he faille.[38]

Concerning his immediate contemporaries, Chaucer is a little less slight. He yields to Boccaccio in the *Troilus and Criseyde* lines

> But sooth is, though I can not tellen al,
> As can myn auctor, of his excellence,
> Yet have I seyd, and, god to-forn, I shal
> In every thing al hoolly his sentence[39]

and would seem to reflect, whimsically, upon Gower in the Introduction to the *Man of Law's Prologue.*[40] The story of Canace

> That lovede hir owne brother sinfully
> Of swiche cursed stories I sey 'fy',[41]

and that of Apollonius of Tyre is dismissed as 'so horrible a tale for to rede.'[42] Chaucer's avowal that he

> Nolde never wryte in none of his sermouns
> Of swiche unkinde abhominaciouns[43]

leads us not only to temper his apostrophe of 'O moral Gower'[44] at the conclusion of *Troilus and Criseyde,* but implies a standard of tale-telling in general that will be mentioned later.[45]

Petrarch, too, comes in for censure in the *Clerk's Prologue;*[46] and although this is

> . . . . . . a worthy clerk
> . . . whose rethoryke sweete

[35] *L.*, 1456 ff.
[36] *B.*, 4537-4541.
[37] *PF.*, 27 ff.
[38] *B.*, 3650 ff.
[39] *TC.*, III, 1324 ff.
[40] *B.*, 77 ff.
[41] *B.*, 79-80.
[42] *B.*, 84.
[43] *B.*, 87-88.
[44] *TC.*, v, 1856.
[45] Cf. below, p. 264.
[46] *E.*, 26 ff.

Digitized by Google | Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

> Enlumined al Itaille of poetrye,
> As Linian dide of philosophye
> Or lawe, or other art particuler,[47]

nevertheless, he is frowned upon for using the 'heigh style,'[48] particularly in the proem to the Griselda story which the clerk considers irrelevant unless it be that Petrarch wishes to impart mere information.

Some slight mention of Chaucer's consideration of his own work has been made above.[49] In the Prologue to the *Legend of Good Women*,[50] he counters the accusation that the *Romance of the Rose* and *Troilus and Criseyde* are heresies against love's law with a list of his other works, and has Alceste say of him

> But wel I wot, with that he can endyte,
> He hath maked lewed folk delyte
> To serve you, in preysing of your name.[51]

In the Apology and Retraction, again, he mentions his work, seeming to regret his 'translacions and endytinges of worldly vanitees,'[52] and would have to his account only 'the translacion of Boece de Consolacione, and othere bokes of Legendes of seintes, and omelies, and moralitee, and devocioun.'[53] How seriously this is to be taken, or under what influences it was written, are questions that lie outside this present pale. The Man of Law's mention of Chaucer in the Introduction to the Prologue of his tale is quite different. He tells us that

> . . . Chaucer, though he can but lewedly
> On metres and on ryming craftily,
> Hath seyd . . . in swich English as he can
> . . . . . of loveres up and doun
> Mo than Ovyde made of mencioun.[54]

Following on this depreciation of his skill, however, which as Root

[47] *E.*, 27 ff.

[48] *E.*, 41, 1148.

[49] Cf. above, pp. 1, 6.

[50] *L.*, 254 ff.

[51] *Ibid.*, 402 ff.; cf. also *HF.*, 633 ff.:

> In thy studie so thou wrytest,
> And ever-mo of love endytest,
> In honour of him . . .

[52] *I.*, 1085 ff.

[53] *I.*, 1087 ff.

[54] *B.*, 47 ff.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

suggests [55] may best be laid to a half-humorous modesty on the part of the poet rather than to any dramatic representation of the opinion of the Man of Law, comes his emphatic condemnation of the *Confessio Amantis* stories, which he

Nolde never wryte in none of his sermouns.[56]

Elsewhere, we have hints of Chaucer's ideas concerning his abilities, and a like modesty shines through the words of the eagle in the *Hous of Fame,*

'That thou so longe . . hast set thy wit—
Although that in thy hede ful lyte is—
To make bokes, songes, dytees,
In ryme, or elles in cadence,
As thou best canst, in reverence
Of Love . . .' [57]

When asked later in the poem

'Artow come hider to han fame?'

he replies, however, that

'Suffyceth me, as I were deed,
That no wight have me name in honde.
I woot my-self best how I stonde;
For what I drye or what I thinke
I wol my-selven al hit drinke,
Certeyn, for the more part:
As ferforth as I can myn art,' [58]

a more serious judgment based upon his own standards. *Troilus and Criseyde,* he tells us, attempts not to rival other poems, but must

. . . subgit be to alle poesye,[59]

and once before, in the same poem, we notice that he modestly pleads guilty to the charge of inadequacy when describing the woe of Criseyde.[60] In the Prologue to the *Legend of Good Women,*[61] he yields place and apologies to the French poets of courtly love,

[55] R. K. Root, *The Poetry of Chaucer*, N. Y., 1922, p. 181, note 2.
[56] *B.*, 87.
[57] *HF.*, 615 ff.
[58] *HF.*, 1872 ff.
[59] *TC.*, v, 1790 ff.
[60] *Ibid.*, iv, 801 ff.
[61] *L.*, 63 ff.

Digitized by Google
Original from
UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

. . . I come after, glening here and there,
And am ful glad if I may finde an ere
Of any goodly word that they han left,[62]

and as a result of this modesty, most endeavours on our part to ferret out a just self-criticism of his work are baffled.[63]

However, regarding the tenets of narrative art in general, Chaucer is more explicit. To be sure, he has left no definite statements concerning art and its functions. The maxim of Hippocrates we find twisted in meaning and applied to love,[64] and the one lone, bare statement that 'craft countrefeteth kinde'[65] is imitated from the *Roman de la Rose*.[66a] However, that Chaucer considered sincerity—that dogma of the artist from Aristotle to Conrad—as essential to his poetry, there can be little doubt. Such is his prayer in the proem to the *Troilus*,

And eek for me preyeth to god so dere,
That I have might to shewe, in som manere,
Everich a word, if it be in his charge,
In Troilus unsely aventure,[66]

and he brings it forth even more forcibly in the Prologue to the *Canterbury Tales:*

For this ye knowen al-so wel as I,
Who-so shal telle a tale after a man,
He moot reherce, as ny as ever he can,
Everich a word, if it be in his charge,
Al speke he never so rudeliche and large;
Or elles he moot telle his tale untrewe,
Or feyne thing, or finde wordes newe.
He may nat spare, al-thogh he were his brother;
He moot as wel seye o word as another.[67]

This note is struck again in the *Miller's Prologue,* for

. . . I moot reherce
Hir tales alle, be they bettre or werse,
Or elles falsen som of my matere,[68]

---

[62] *Ibid.*

[63] Cf. *Envoy to Scogan*, 34 ff.; *BD.*, 1330-1334; *A.*, 1459-1461.

[64] *PF.*, 1 ff.

[65] *HF.*, 1213.

[66a] Cf. *Roman de la Rose*, l. 16233.

[66] *TC.*, I, 32 ff.; cf. also, *HF.*, 523 ff. and the various invocations to this poem.

[67] *A.*, 730 ff.

[68] *A.*, 3173 ff.

Digitized by Google   Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

and in the *Maunciple's Tale*

> The word mot nede accorde with the dede.
> If men shal telle properly a thing,
> The word mot cosin be to the werking.[69]

That the same holds true toward the authors whom he translates, we have, once more, abundant evidence. He will not falsify their material, any more than he would his own. In *Troilus and Criseyde,* for instance,

> I can no more, but of thise ilke tweye,
> To whom this tale sucre be or soot,
> Though that I tarie a yeer, som-tyme I moot
> After myn auctor, tellen hir gladnesse,
> As wel as I have told hir hevinesse.[70]

In the same poem, and for the same reason,—'thus seith the book'—he beseeches

> . . . every lady bright of hewe,
> And every gentil womman, what she be,
> That al be that Criseyde was untrewe,
> That for that gilt she be not wrooth with me.
> Ye may hir gilt in othere bokes see.[71]

At times, to be sure, he allows a thought of his own to intrude, but catches it back with immediate reference to his author. Thus, somewhat deliciously, in the *Legend of Dido* when she and Aeneas have sought refuge in the cave,

> I noot, with hem if ther wente any mo;
> The autour maketh of hit no mencioun.[72]

---

[69] *H.*, 208 ff.

[70] *TC.*, III, 1193 ff.; cf. also, *G.*, 24-25, 79-84.

[71] *TC.*, V, 1772 ff.

[72] *L.*, 1227 ff.; cf. also, *TC.*, I, 393 ff.; *Ibid.*, II, 699 ff.; *Ibid.*, III, 575 ff.; *Ibid.*, IV, 1415 ff.: *L.*, 1021 ff.: *Ibid.*, 1721. Chaucer may, however, deliberately lead us astray. In the *Troilus*, for instance, concerning his heroine:

> . . whether that she children hadde or noon,
> I rede it nought; therefore I lete it goon,
> (I, 132 ff.)

whereas his author, Boccaccio, did tell of her children! Cf. Chaucer's ascription of the account of Emily's sacrifice to Statius (A 2294), and his denial of knowledge concerning the flight of Arcite's soul (A 2810 ff.).

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

Chaucer, also, had quite clear conceptions of various literary types. The monk defines tragedy as a story of one of high estate fallen into misery, and that must end unhappily.[74] Such is Chaucer's own classification of the *Troilus and Criseyde*—

> Go, litel book, go litel my tregedie[75]

with its following hope that its author may some day write in comedy.[76] This latter, we may take as being defined for us by the knight (who, with the host, finds fault with the tragic type) when he says

> . . . the contrarie is joie and greet solas,
> As whan a man hath been in povre estaat,
> And clymbeth up, and wexeth fortunat,
> And ther abydeth in prosperitee.[77]

Mars, in the proem of his complaint,[78] expounds the necessities of the correct 'ordre of compleynt,' much as the Pardoner makes plain the requirements of a sermon.[79] The Parson holds distinction between fable and sermon,[80] as does Chaucer between those tales of the Canterbury cycle 'that sounen into sinne'[81] and those

> . . . . that toucheth gentillesse
> And eek moralitee and holinesse.[82]

Hence, the Miller and the Reeve, he says, tell tales of the former type,[83] whereas that of the Knight[84] and Chaucer's *Tale of Melibeus*[85] are of the latter. Tales such as Gower's, already referred to,[86] are 'unkinde abhominaciouns' and not to be written by Chaucer. Courthope, Saintsbury, and Manly have pointed out the implied criticism of romance-writers in the *Sir Thopas*.[87]

[74] *B.*, 3161 ff.
[75] *TC.*, v, 1786.
[76] *Ibid.*, 1787 ff.
[77] *B.*, 3964 ff.
[78] *CM.*, 155 ff.
[79] *C.*, 329 ff.
[80] *I.*, 31 ff.
[81] *Ibid.*, 1087.
[82] *A.*, 3179 ff.
[83] *Ibid.*, 3182 ff.
[84] *Ibid.*, 3109 ff.:

> . . . nas ther yong ne old
> That he ne seyde it was a noble storie.

[85] *B.*, 2130:

> It is a moral tale vertuous

[86] Cf. above, p. 259.
[87] Cf. above, note 4.

Digitized by Google | Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

As for the technique of the tale, itself, we can surmise some of his requirements. The charge of prolixity that is often brought against Chaucer, he answers in the *Troilus and Criseyde,*

> But flee we now prolixitee best is,
> For love of god, and lat us faste go
> Right to the effect, with-oute tales mo,
> Why al this folk assembled in this place;
> And lat us of hir saluinges pace,[88]

and later,

> But al passe I, lest ye to longe dwelle;
> For for o fyn is al that ever I telle.[89]

It was prolixity, too, for which he criticized Flaccus,[90] and on similar ground the Clerk takes exception to Petrarch.[91] The effect's the thing, as Pandarus knew—'th' ende is every tales strengthe.'[92] A tale is all for some conclusion. The Knight cuts short his description of Theseus' entertainment for this reason,[93] as he did his account of the fight in the grove[94] and does later with the discourse of the gods.[95] 'The fruit of every tale is for to seye'[96] claims the Man of Law, and in the *Legend of Cleopatra*[97] the same plea is made. One finds it recurring throughout the poems.[98]

In aid of this 'effecte,' Chaucer would cut out all extraneous matter. What Alcione said in her swoon is forbidden us.[99] Simi-

[88] *TC.*, II, 1564 ff.
[89] *Ibid.* 1595-1596.
[90] Cf. above, p. 6.
[91] Cf. above, p. 7.
[92] *TC.*, II, 258 ff.
[93] *A.*, 2206:

> Of al this make I now no mencioun;
> But al th'effect, that thinketh me the beste;
> Now comth the poynt . . .

[94] *Ibid.*, 1187 ff.
[95] *Ibid.*, 2479 ff.
[96] *B.*, 706.
[97] *L.*, 622:

> And forthy to th'effect than wol I skippe,
> And al the remenant, I wol lete hit slippe.

[98] Cf. *TC.*, III, 513; *Ibid.*, 604; *Ibid.*, 1676 ff.; *Ibid.*, IV, 15 ff.; *Ibid.*, V, 1031 ff.; *L.*, 2403; *A.*, 2919 ff., etc.
[99] *BD.*, 215 ff.

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

larly in the *Troilus,* the story of Troy

> . . . how this toun com to destruccioun
> Ne falleth nought to purpos me to telle;
> For it were here a long digressioun
> Fro my matere, and yow to longe dwelle.[100]

The Friar complains that the preamble to the *Wife of Bath's Tale* is too long.[101] Chaucer, himself, is continually afraid of sermonizing,[102] and 'other things collateral' are cut away as not according to his matter. The evidence on this point is extremely profuse.[103]

> And for it is no fruit but los of tyme.[104]

says the Squire; nor will the poet describe all that he sees in the House of Fame

> . . . . . I nil as now not ryme,
> For ese of yow, and losse of tyme:
> For tyme y-lost, this knowen ye,
> By no way may recovered be.[105]

The insertion of exempla, however, he will admit. As the Pardoner says

> Than telle I hem ensamples many oon
> Of olde stories, longe tym agoon:
> For lewed peple loven tales olde;
> Swich thinges can they wel reporte and holde.[106]

But the Knight makes plain, that here also, there must be moderation,[107] and, consequently, omits his illustrative tale of Perotheus

[100] *TC.*, I, 141 ff.

[101] *D.*, 829 ff.

[102] *TC.*, II, 965 ff.; *Ibid.*, 1299; *L.*, 1184; *Ibid.*, 2025; *CM.*, 209.

[103] The following are among the most obvious: *PF.*, 326; *HF.*, 1299 ff.; *Ibid.*, 1341 ff.; *TC.*, v, 1765 ff.; *L.*, 953 ff.; *A.*, 994 ff.

[104] *F.*, 74.

[105] *HF.*, 1503 ff.; cf. also, *L.*, 570 ff.; *Ibid.*, 995 ff.; *Ibid.*, 1002 ff.; *Ibid.*, 1552 ff.; *Ibid.*, 1920 ff.; etc.; *A.*, 1189 ff.; *Ibid.*, 1380; *B.*, 374.

[106] *C.*, 435 ff.

[107] *A.*, 1953 ff.:

> Suffyceth heer ensamples oon or two,
> And though I coude rekne a thousand mo.

and *Ibid.*, 2039:

> Suffyceth oon ensample in stories olde.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

and Theseus.[108] For him, as for Kipling, that is another story. That there is no need to tell more of the exemplum than that part that bears on the point in hand is illustrated by the Wife of Bath's tale of Midas' wife, with its abrupt curtailment,

> The remenant of the tale if ye wol here,
> Redeth Ovyde, and ther ye may it lere.[109]

Concerning style, Chaucer again has his distinctions. The Miller and the Reeve are churls as are many of the other pilgrims,

> And harlotrye they tolden bothe two,[110]

the poet apologizing for 'hir wordes and hir chere.'[111] In *Troilus and Criseyde* a similar consistency is shown.[112] The host adjures the Clerk not to preach or tell a dull story, but to speak intelligibly and to keep his pedantic terms, fine phrases ('colours'), and figures of speech until that time he would write in the high style for kings.[113] It is for using the high style, however, that the Clerk partly blames Petrarch,[114] although the Franklin apologizes because

> Colours ne knowe I none.[115]

Again, the eagle speaks deprecatingly of them in the *House of Fame*,[116] but there is a hint of Chaucer's conscious use of such rhetorical devices in the *Troilus* when he writes

> The dayes honour, and the hevenes eye,
> The nightes fo, al this clepe I the sonne,[117]

and in the *Franklin's Tale*

> For th'orisonte hath reft the sonne his light;
> This is as muche to seye as it was night.[118]

Chaucer's interest in metrics has been already noticed in the

[108] *Ibid.*, 1201.
[109] *D.*, 981 ff.
[110] *A.*, 3184; cf. also 3169.
[111] *A.*, 728.
[112] *TC.*, I, 12 ff.:

> . . . to a sorwful tale, a sory chere.

[113] *E.*, 12 ff.
[114] *Ibid.*, 41, 1148.
[115] *F.*, 723.
[116] *HF.*, 855 ff.
[117] *TC.*, II, 904 ff.
[118] *F.*, 1017 ff.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

criticism of the Man of Law.[119] In the *House of Fame,* he says that

> Though som vers faile in a sillable;
> . . . . . I do no diligence
> To shewe craft, but o sentence.[120]

Tragedies, says the Monk,

> . . . . . ben versifyed comunly
> Of six feet, which men clepe *exametron.*[121]

The host calls the 'drasty ryming' of Sir Thopas, 'rym dogeral,'[122] and consigns it to the devil.

This, then, may finish an all too brief discussion of Chaucer's concern with matters of literary technique. It will suffice, I believe, to point out very definite indication of the poet's tendencies and interests in these fields. For us, it may not only serve to throw some little light on what Professor Mead calls 'the true Chaucer, working in his own way, and controlling his sources instead of being partly controlled by them,'[123] but on the beginnings of English literary criticism as well.

WHITNEY HASTINGS WELLS.

Harvard University.

NOTES ON THE CHRONOLOGY OF LOPE DE VEGA'S *COMEDIAS*

One of the greatest handicaps in the way of understanding the development of Lope de Vega's and the seventeenth-century Spanish theatre in general has been the lack of definite knowledge of the dates of many of the plays. The material has been so vast and has come down to us in so imperfect a form, that the task has not been an easy one. Where there are no autograph manuscripts, it has often been possible, it is true, to determine the date by internal evidence, such as references to contemporary events. The versification has also served at times to indicate the period in which a play was written, although only within broad limits. But

[119] Cf. above, p. 8.
[120] *HF.*, 1098 ff.
[121] *B.*, 3169.
[122] *Ibid.*, 2109 ff.
[123] *P. M. L. A.*, XVI, p. 388.

Digitized by Google   Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

with the exception of the investigations of Professor S. G. Morley [1] and more recently of Professor M. A. Buchanan,[2] no serious and sustained efforts have been made as yet to study the versification of individual playwrights in the hope of discovering, if possible, the general characteristics and peculiar marks of their work, and the trend in the use of the different metres. Professor Buchanan, in the pamphlet just referred to, has studied the versification of almost one hundred of Lope's plays that could be accurately or approximately dated, so as to get some criteria that would help in fixing the chronology of the remaining undated plays.

As the value of these criteria will be increased with the number of plays on which they are based, I submit the following data on a number of Lope's *comedias* that might be added to Professor Buchanan's list, together with the reasons for ascribing the dates given. It is with some hesitancy that I include plays on the basis of reference to historical events, for it is quite possible that such references were interpolated later. Still one is justified in admitting plays on this basis, so long as the versification is in accordance with that of other plays of the same date.

El Cerco de Santa Fe, 1587?-98? Restori supposes this *comedia* to have been written after 1587.[3] It contains a speech in which mention is made of several Spanish kings up to and including Philip II;[4] hence I suppose it to be not later than 1598. The presence of the allegorical personages of España and Fama might indicate an early date, though not necessarily (*cf.* the figure of España in *El mejor mozo de España*, written 1611). Published 1604, this is one of the very few plays which up to that time contained *décimas* (abba: accddc).

El casamiento en la muerte, 1598?-1604. Contains reference to Philip III.[5] Published 1604 (Part I).

Los tres diamantes, 1599-1602. Belardo and Lucinda (Micaela Luján) are among the characters. References to Lucinda in

[1] *Studies in Spanish Dramatic Versification of the Siglo de Oro. Alarcón and Moreto. University of California Publications in Modern Philology*, VII (1918), n. 3, 131-173.

[2] *The Chronology of Lope de Vega's Plays*, 1922; No. 6, Philological Series, *University of Toronto Studies*.

[3] *Cf.* Rennert y Castro, *Vida de Lope de Vega*, p. 469.

[4] *Obras de Lope de Vega* (edited by Menéndez Pelayo), Acad., XI, 256[a].

[5] Acad., VII, 277[a].

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

Lope's work begin in 1599.[6] A. Castro places this play before 1602.[7] Published 1609 (Part II).

La ocasión perdida, 1599-1603. Another Belardo-Lucinda play.[8] Cited in P (1603); published 1609 (Part II).

Los embustes de Celauro, 1599-1603. Lucinda does not appear here, but is spoken of.[9] We might suppose, from the nature of the references to her, that this play belonged to the last year or two of the period indicated, when Lope's relations with Micaela were happiest and most intense.[10] Cited in P; published 1614 (Part IV).

Lucinda perseguida, 1599-1603. Another Belardo-Lucinda *comedia.*[11] Cited in P; published 1621 (Part XVII).

Los esclavos libres, 1599-1603? Lucinda Luján (!), the heroine, praised for her beauty and *ingenio.*[12] Cited in P; published in 1620 (Part XIII), shortly before which time it was retouched.[13]

El caballero de Illescas, 1601?-03. Belardo praises Lucinda[14] and relates his unhappiness at not being in Andalusia with his loved one.[15] We know that Lope was with Micaela in Seville at different times during 1601-04.[16] Cited in P; published 1620 (Part XIV).

El secretario de sí mismo, 1604?-05? Another Belardo-Lucinda play. Castro supposes its date to be not much later than 1604.[17] Cited in P^2 (1618).

El hombre de bien, 1605?-08? Jacinto (= Lope) and Lucinda

[6] *Cf.* Américo Castro, *Alusiones a Micaela Luján en las obras de Lope de Vega,* in *Revista de filología española,* V (1918), 259.

[7] *Ibid.,* p. 261.

[8] *Ibid.,* p. 266.

[9] *Comedias escogidas de Lope de Vega,* in *Biblioteca de autores españoles,* XXIV, 104[b], 107[a].

[10] *Rev. fil. esp.,* V, 261, 268. This play is not quoted by Castro, however.

[11] *Ibid.,* V, 263.

[12] *Obras de Lope de Vega* (edited by Cotarelo); Acad. N. (Nueva edición), V, 408[a]. *Ingenio* in this passage must be taken to mean Micaela's talent as an actress, and not culture. *Cf.* A. Castro, *Rev. fil. esp.,* V, 270; Castro does not, however, include this play in his study.

[13] Acad., N., V, p. XXIV.

[14] Acad., N., IV, 138[a], 139[b].

[15] Acad., N., IV, 136[b].

[16] Rennert y Castro, *op. cit.,* pp. 148-9.

[17] *Rev. fil. esp.,* V, 278.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

appear. A statement by the latter,[18] seems to indicate that the date of this play falls about six years after the beginning of Lope's and Micaela's love-affair.[19] Cited in P^2; published in 1615 (Part VI).

El castigo del discreto, 1606?-12? Internal evidence shows it to have been written before 1612 and after 1598, either in 1598-1601 or 1606-12. I am inclined to favor the latter date.[20] Cited in P^2.

La hermosa Ester, 1610. Autograph Ms. in British Museum.

La burgalesa de Lerma, 1613? A manuscript (copy) exists, dated Nov. 30, 1613. The original could not have been written much earlier, if the statement made in the play by Belardo concerning Julia's death is an allusion to the death of his wife, Juana de Guardo (died Aug. 13, 1613).[21] In the same scene Belardo speaks in a way that points without doubt to his decision to enter the priesthood. This allows us to correct the statement made by Rennert[22] and Castro[23] that Lope did not make this decision until 1614. Cotarelo, on the other hand, makes the mistake of supposing that Lope had already taken orders when this play was written;[24] he was not ordained, as a matter of fact, until the spring of 1614.[25]

El animal de Hungría, 1613?-1617. Lope refers here, as in the last play, to his intention of ceasing to write for the theatre.[26] The long speech of the rustic barber, who is here Lope's mouth-

[18] "Con tal secreto me rendí ha seis años Del amor de Jacinto," etc. *Bib. aut. esp.*, LII, 193ᵃ.

[19] *Rev. fil. esp.*, V, 279-80.

[20] J. F. Montesinos, in an article published since this was written, supposes it to date from 1603-08. Cf. *Rev. fil. esp.* IX, 402-3. See my edition of the play to be published shortly.

[21] Acad., N., IV, 63ᵇ.

[22] *Life of Lope de Vega*, p. 210.

[23] *Vida de Lope de Vega*, p. 217.

[24] Acad., N., IV, 64ᵃ, n. 2.

[25] Rennert y Castro, *op. cit.*, p. 218.

[26] Just as in *La burgalesa de Lerma*, Belardo had said: "La pluma y papel rompí, Colgué a un sauce el instrumento" (Acad., N., IV, 63ᵇ), so here the barber declares: "Y aun las [historias] humanas muy presto También las pienso dejar" (Acad., N., III, 425ᵇ), and "Que quiero colgar la pluma, como otros cuelgan la espada" (Acad., N., III, 426ᵃ).

Digitized by Google
Original from
UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

piece, is interesting besides for the defense it contains of his theatre and his claim to being the inventor of the *comedia*. Cited in P²; published 1617 (Part IX).

Los ramilletes de Madrid, 1615?-1618. Contains reference to the double marriage of Philip IV and Elizabeth and Louis XIII and Anne (1615).[27] Published in 1618 (Part XI).

Al pasar del arroyo, 1615?-1619. Contains description of the entrance into Madrid of Princess Elizabeth, wife of Philip IV, that took place Nov. 19, 1615.[28] (Professor Buchanan included this play in his earlier list in *MLN.,* 1909.) Cited in P²; published 1619 (Part XII).

La mayor desgracia de Carlos V, 1625?-32. According to Menéndez Pelayo, this play dates after 1625, because of the reference in it to the prophetic tolling of the bell of Velilla in that year.[29] Published 1632-33 (Part XXIV).

No son todos ruiseñores, 1630?-35. We read in this play of the marriage of Philip IV's sister, María, to the King of Hungary, heir to the Empire.[30] (She was married by proxy to the Prince of Guastalla, in Madrid, on Oct. 3, 1629.[31]) There is also reference to the birth of a son to Philip IV and Queen Elizabeth (Oct., 1629), and a description of the festival celebrating the Prince's baptism;[32] also mention of María's departure for Hungary[33] and of her being accompanied part of the way through Spain by Philip IV, the Queen, and Philip's two brothers.[34] As Philip did not return to Madrid until the early part of 1630,[35] this play must have been written between then and 1635, when it was published in Part XXII.[35a]

As an example of the way in which dates suggested for plays

[27] *Bib. aut. esp.*, LII, 314ᵃ,ᶜ.
[28] *Bib. aut. esp.*, XXIV, 393ᵇ,ᶜ, 394ᵃ.
[29] Acad., XII, p. LVI. *Cf.* Rennert y Castro, *op. cit.*, p. 495.
[30] Acad., XV, 98ᵃ.
[31] Hume, *The Court of Philip IV*, p. 209.
[32] Acad., XV, 98ᵃ.
[33] Acad., XV, 98ᵇ.
[34] Acad., XV, 99ᵃ.
[35] Hume, *op. cit.*, p. 221.
[35a] I have since seen J. F. Montesinos' article in *Rev. fil. esp.*, IX, 30 ff. He dates it 1630.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

on the basis of internal evidence may be checked up by their versification, I may refer to *En los indicios la culpa,* which is said to have been dated 1620 in the manuscript, now lost, that was formerly in the Osuna library.[36] The versification is *redond.,* 87%; *quint.,* 9%; *romance,* 4%; *décimas,* 1%; the very low percentage of *romance* does not correspond at all to Lope's practice at this time, as Professor Buchanan's schedule will show. I have wondered, therefore, whether 1620 might not be a slip for 1602. The versification would fit in very well with this date (*cf. El cordobés valeroso,* 1603: *redond.,* 74%; *quint.,* 5%; *romance,* 7%; etc.). The references in the play to the Christian martyrs in Japan would show it to date at least after 1597.

I should like to suggest the following changes in dates given by Professor Buchanan:

El gran duque de Moscovia, 1603?-08, instead of 1603?-13? Lope would hardly have written of Lucinda after 1608: "¡Qué bellísima mujer! ¡A cuanto mira sujeta! ¡Dichoso el que amaneciere Con tan bello sol al lado!" [37]

El príncipe despeñado, 1602, not 1601-06. There is an autograph Ms.

El cordobés valeroso, 1603, not 1602-03. Autograph Ms.

El mayor imposible, 1615, not 1614.[38]

El cuerdo loco, 1602, not 1601-06. Autograph Ms.

[36] Rennert y Castro, *op. cit.,* p. 479.

[37] *Bib. aut. esp.,* LII, 267ᵃ. Cf. also *Rev. fil. esp.,* V, 279, and Rennert y Castro, *op. cit.,* p. 484.

[38] Rennert y Castro, *op. cit.,* p. 227.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

SCHEDULE OF VERSIFICATION [39]

DATE	TITLE	Redondillas	Quintillas	Romance	Décimas	Octavas	Tercetos	Sueltos	Silvas	Sonetos	Liras	Miscellaneous	OPENING AND CLOSING VERSES IN EACH ACT
1587?–98?	El cerco de Santa Fe	47	21	13	3	11		5				(14) [40] song	I. oct.-oct. II. re.-déc. III. oct.-q.
1598?–1604	El casamiento en la muerte	46	19	15		9	3	6		1			I. oct.-re. II. re.-rom. III. re.-re.
1599–1602?	Los tres diamantes	55	20	7		2	4	10		2			I. ter.-re. II. re.-re. III. re.-re.
1599–1603	La ocasión perdida (not accessible to me)												
1599–1603	Los embustes de Celauro	49	24	8		5		8		2	3		I. q.-re. II. suelt.-q. III. lira-re.
1599–1603	Lucinda perseguida (not accessible to me)												
1599–1603?	Los esclavos libres	38	36	7		9		10		1/2			I. q.-suelt. II. q.-rom. III. red.-suelt.
1601?–03	El caballero de Illescas	77		11		8	2			1/2		(20) song	I. re.-oct. II. re.-son. III. oct.-rom.
1604?–05?	El secretario de sí mismo (not accessible to me)												
1604?–09?	El ruiseñor de Sevilla. [41]	70	6	11		2		10		1		(13) song	I. re.-re. II. re.-re. III. q.-rom.

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

1605?–08?	El hombre de bien	53	24	8		3	3	9		1			I. re.-re. II. q.-re. III. re.-rom.
1606?–12?	El castigo del discreto	49	31	11		1	2	6		1/2			I. re.-q. II. re.-rom. III. re.-rom.
1610	La hermosa Ester	26	20	22	12	8	1	6		1	4	(16) seguid. (10) song	I. rom.-oct. II. suelt.-rom. III. re.-rom.
1613?	La burgalesa de Lerma	30	21	35	3	4		5		1	1	(123) song	I. re.-re. II. q.-rom. III. re.-rom.
1613?–17	El animal de Hungría	40	17	21	7	1	5	6	1/2	2			I. silva-rom. II. q.-rom. III. re.-rom.
1615?–18	Los ramilletes de Madrid	36	9	33	5	8	3	2		1	2	(36) song	I. re.-rom. II. ter.-re. III. re.-rom.
1615?–19	Al pasar del arroyo	52	6	20	3	1		6	2	1/2		(20) song (114) endecha (12) seguid.	I. q.-rom. II. re.-rom. III. déc.-rom.
1625?–32	La mayor desgracia de Carlos V	23		61	2	7		1	2	1/2	4	(5) song	I. re.-rom. II. re.-rom. III. re.-rom.
1630?–35	No son todos ruiseñores	39		38	12	8	2		1/2	1/2		(46) song	I. re.-rom. II. re.-rom. III. déc.-rom.

[39] In this Schedule I have followed Professor Buchanan's arrangement, so as to facilitate comparison of this table with his. The only change I have made has been the addition of a separate column for *liras*. Numbers indicate percentage of verse forms.

[40] Numbers in parentheses mean lines of verse, not percentage.

[41] J. F. Montesinos dates this play 1604-1609, believing it to be nearer 1604. *Cf. Rev. fil. esp.*, IX, 35 f.

Girard College, Philadelphia. WILLIAM L. FICHTER.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

NOTES ON PERFORMANCES OF FRENCH MYSTERY PLAYS

Paris, 1539.—The anonymous *Cronique du Roy François Premier* contains the following passage (p. 268 of the edition of Georges Guiffrey, 1860):

"Le dimenche XVIII^e jour de may, ondict an (i. e. 1539) fut faict une monstre à Paris du mistère et jeu de la passion, qui fut chouse fort triumphante et magnificque, car tous les personnaiges estoyent habillez de veloufs, drap d'or, satin et d'aultres de soye de diverses couleurs, et n'y avoit personnaige qui ne fust habillé de différant habit, qui estoit chouse admirable et délectable à veoir.

Et le lundi, landemain de la Pentecouste, XXVI^e jour dudict mois ondict an, on commensa à jouer ledict jeu et misteire au logis de Flandres, qui est ung fort grant logis, onquel y avoit plusieurs eschaffaulx fort sumptueulx et tenduz de riches tapisseries pour recepvoir les princes qui y assistèrent, et mesmes le Roy et Messeigneurs le Daulphin et duc d'Orléans, ses enffans, et aultres princes et gentilzhommes en grand nombre; et commancèrent ce dict jour à jouer le mistère d'Abraham et sacrifice de Isaac son seul filz et unique."

This passage was not known in its entirety to Petit de Julleville when he wrote his work on the French mystery plays and has never been adequately considered in its relation to the religious drama. The "mistère et jeu de la passion" of the *Cronique* was in all probability Jean Michel's *Passion,* this being the one passion play that seems to have been popular in Paris at this time. From 1486 to 1542 some eleven or twelve printed editions of it appeared, probably all in Paris, and the title pages of certain of these mention performances in Paris in 1490 and 1507. Petit de Julleville states (II, 137) that the edition of 1539 mentions a recent representation of the play at Paris (which would naturally be the one in the *Cronique*), but the abridged title page of this edition in Brunet's *Manuel* (III, 1975) does not include such mention.

The most interesting fact which the *Cronique* seems clearly to show is that the "mistère," which probably required five or six days for its performance, was preceded by an introductory performance of the *Sacrifice d'Abraham* as an Old Testament antitype or prefiguration of Christ's sacrificial passion.[1] The *Passion* of Jean

[1] This play of *Abraham,* as the brothers Parfait have pointed out, is simply section VII of the well-known *Mystère du Vieux Testament,* touched up a little.

Digitized by Google
Original from
UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

Michel, in the form in which it was always printed and doubtless generally played, had no Old Testament scenes but began with the nativity of the Virgin and the nativity of Christ. The more common French practice, however, was to have, introductory to the passion, that is, to the redemption of sin, certain scenes relating to the origin of sin. The usual tradition included the Creation, the Fall of the Angels, the Fall of Man, the Slaying of Abel, Noah's Ark, the Debate of the Four Virtues (as to whether Man should be saved) and the Prophets of Christ. These scenes, in so far as they are from the Old Testament, were not, however, used as antitypes or prefigurations of New Testament events. Prefigurations are rare in the French religious drama, much rarer than in Germany, and this makes this Paris case of 1539 especially noteworthy. I know of no other similar case in France,[2] unless it be at Lyons, where this Parisian example seems to have been promptly imitated. In the permanent theater of Jean Neyron at Lyons, which lasted but three years, 1538 to 1541, performances of the Old and New Testaments were given.[3] Now, of the three printed editions of the *Sacrifice d'Abraham,* one mentions no performance, one mentions the performance at Paris in 1539, and the third says it was played "à Paris et depuis à Lyon." While this may mean simply its performance at Lyons in its regular position in the Old Testament cycle, it seems more probable from being thus linked with the Paris performance that it was used at Lyons also as a prefigurative introduction to the passion.

There are close German parallels to this use of the *Abraham.* At Frankfurt in 1498 a passion play lasting five days was given. The first of these days was devoted entirely to introductory scenes, beginning with Abraham's sacrifice, but including also the story of Susanna, the parable of the rich man and Lazarus, and of the

[2] In the *mystères mimés* at Lille and Béthune, and doubtless elsewhere, scenes of the New Testament were at times accompanied by Old Testament prefigurations, usually two to each, after the manner of the *biblia pauperum.* At St. Omer, in 1443, payments were made for a "mistère du viel Testament et rapporté au nouvel." (Justin de Pas, *Mystères et Jeux Scéniques à Saint-Omer*, 1913, p. 34). A careful search would probably reveal a few other French cases; for Germany see Toni Weber, *Die Praefigurationen im geistlichen Drama Deutschlands*, 1919 (Marburg Diss.)

[3] Petit de Julleville, II, 135.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

prodigal son, all four of these being prefigurative of moments in the following passion.[4] At Löbau, on Holy Cross day, 1521, there was a procession or *mystère mimé* with nineteen "figures" showing in sequence the life of Christ, preceded by two "figures" from the Old Testament, Adam and Eve and Abraham's Sacrifice.[5] At Uerdingen, in the seventeenth century, a brief dialog between Abraham and Isaac preceded the passion on Good Friday.[6] At Villingen, in the early eighteenth century, a passion play was given every two years, preceded by one Old Testament prefiguration, a different one each time.[7]

The only part of the passage from the *Cronique* that Petit de Julleville used was the first paragraph and this only as inaccurately cited by Sorel[8] with the omission of the "à Paris." He knew the whole passage later, in time for a brief reference to it in his appendix (II, 645), but failed to point out or correct the misstatements in the body of his work that resulted from his not knowing it earlier. His half page concerning the passion play at Compiègne in 1539 (II, 136) must be entirely deleted. His statement (II, 137) that it is generally believed that the *confrères* did not come to the Hôtel de Flandres until 1540 and that the editions of the *Sacrifice d'Abraham* and of Jean Michel's *Passion,* both bearing the date of 1539 with mention of performances in the Hôtel de Flandres, are probably ante-dated needs revision or deletion, especially as it conflicts with an earlier true statement of his own about the *Abraham* (I, 423). Although, as is well-known, the *confrères* gave the *Mystère du Vieux Testament* in 1542, Petit de Julleville's remark (II, 137) connecting the *Abraham* of 1539 with this latter undertaking, as a sort of preliminary "try-out"—"cette représentation fut un essai dont le succès les encouragea"—is doubtless unwarranted and ignores the prefigurative relation of the *Abraham* to the *Passion.*

[4] Froning, *Drama des Mittelalters,* p. 542.

[5] Karl Preusker, *Blicke in die vaterländische Vorzeit* (1841), p. 96-100.

[6] A. Rein, *Vier geistliche Spiele des 17. Jahrhunderts für Charfreitag und Fronleichnamsfest,* p. 17-22.

[7] *Freiburger Diozesan-Archiv,* 1916, p. 185.

[8] *Notice sur les mystères représentés à Compiègne au moyen âge,* in the *Bulletin de la Société historique de Compiègne,* II, 43. Cf. Petit de Julleville, II, 136.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

Germain Bapst knew this passage, for he says in connection with the Hôtel de Flandres: "A prendre à la lettre la *Chronique de François 1er* on pourrait supposer que l'on construisait à l'extrémité de la salle opposée à la scène une estrade spacieuse, élevée, d'où l'on dominait le spectacle, pour y placer le souverain et les princes." [9] This supposition, somewhat hesitatingly made, is doubtless correct, for there was the same general arrangement in the Hôtel d'Orléans at St. Marcel, a near suburb (now a part) of Paris, when the *Mystère de St. Christophe* was given there in 1540: " . . . item, fault faire ung autre escharfault (*i. e.,* other than the stage scaffold) de l'autre costé, vis-à-vis dudict escharfault cy dessus, qui sera de quatorze toises de long sur six piedz dedans oeuvre, cloz et couvert, reste devant, pour la veue dud. jeu, garny d'une montée en lymon, comme dessus, ledict escharfault deuement soustenu et garny d'aiz, tellement qu'il n'en puisse venir fault . . . " [10]

Paris, 1541.—There has been preserved a diary written by some one in the entourage of Duke William of Cleves and telling of the Duke's journey to France in 1541 to wed Joan of Navarre, niece of Francis I. After the wedding and the sumptuous festivities that followed (which are described also in detail in the *Cronique* that we have been considering), the Duke left his child-wife with her mother and started upon his return journey, going by way of Paris. At this point occurs the following passage:

Op Guidesdach ipso Petri et Pauli, XXIX. Junii VII mylen vortan gereden to Parisz. Uitwendich der Stadt . . . quaemen syner g. vnder oogen

---

[9] *Essai sur l'histoire du théâtre,* p. 69.

[10] E. Coyecque, *Recueil d'actes notariés relatifs à l'histoire de Paris et de ses environs au XVIe siècle,* (in *Histoire générale de Paris*), p. 294. Cohen (*Histoire de la mise en scène,* p. 83, 87, and 136) was the first to call attention to the interesting contracts preliminary to this play. He cites the details about the music and about the stage and "paradis," but does not give the passage here cited, nor the following one:

" . . . (the work to be done in fifteen days) avecques la barriere de boys pour servir au gardefol à l'entrée dud. jeu, et la maçonnerie de l'enfer, de plastre et peine seullement, et lesd. Veau et consors seront tenuz fournir de pierre et moislon, tant qu'il en fauldra; et si fournira ledict Corivault de deux pieces de boys d'ung demy pied en carrure et de troys toises de long, pour faire ung gibet garny d'une piece à travers des deux liens; et led. jeu fyny, reprandra ledict Corivault tout son boys et ayz . . ."

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

die oeuerste von der Stadt Parisz . . . und hebben syne g. vergleidet an eyns Edelmans husz, dair syn g. to gaste geladen was.

Achter desem huyse was ein groet schoen Theatrum mit eynen hoegen pauillion van lynendoick bedeckt, vnd was dat Theatrum gemaicht int Ronde off die Romische alde maniere, dat alle menschen sitten mochten, die eyn hoeger dan di ander, tot XX gesessen toe vnd dair bauen noch III solders int ronde, alle mit verscheiden kaemeren vnd galeryen lustlich gemaicht. In desem Theatro hatt men des naemiddachs ein schon spill gehalden van etlichen historien, vitten geschefften der Apostolen, de Petro, Symone Mago et Herode mit seer frembden und lustigen solemniteten und triumph kostlich zugerüst, wilchs myn gn. her mit angesehen, dair dan eine groisze unzalbar hauff van luiden gewest vnd mit zugesehen.

Und des auentz, als solchs geschiet, hauen die Meisters van den Spille mynen gn. hern eyne collation oder Bancket zugerust, vnd is syn g. alsdan gereden in des Ammirals husz by S. Anthonisz straisse, aldair syn f. g. logiert gewest.[11]

We have here a few interesting facts which, so far as I know, have never been brought to the attention of students of the early religious drama. It is well known that the *confrères de la Passion* were giving the *Actes des Apôtres* in Paris in 1541 on their indoor stage in the Hôtel de Flandres. Here, however, is trustworthy evidence of an afternoon's performance, given presumably also by the *confrères,* in an outdoor theater of a type usual in the provinces but not before known to have been used in Paris, "a beautiful, large, theater, covered with a high pavilion of linen cloth, the theatre made round in the old Roman manner, so that all the people could sit, one higher than the other, up to twenty rows of seats, and above all around, three more tiers, all pleasantly made with different chambers and galleries." The performance was evidently a special one in honor of the Duke, who was entertained lavishly throughout his stay in France, and it is reasonable to assume that the theater was a temporary one built for this special purpose. Whether it was used more than this once it is impossible to say. A somewhat similar case was in 1542 when the *confrères* who were then playing the *Vieux Testament* were ordered to give a special performance of this upon the occasion of a visit of the Duke of Vendome, but they gave it apparently upon their usual indoor stage.[12] The play of

[11] *Zeitschrift des Bergischen Geschichtsvereins,* I, 34; the diary has also been published in Lacomblet's *Archiv für die Geschichte des Niederrheins,* V, 129 f.

[12] Petit de Julleville, II, 141.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

1541 for the Duke of Cleves was plainly a part of the long *Actes des Apôtres.* If it was a regular section of this play, as preserved in printed form, it must have been from Book IV, for this is the only place where the three characters mentioned, Peter, Simon Magus, and Herod Agrippa, all appear within the possible limits of an afternoon's performance. Even thus Simon Magus would not have an important or effective role. We know, however, that plays were often cut, and it is possible, especially for this unique occasion, that some special arrangement or abridgement was given.

Béthune, 1562.—At Béthune it was customary to stage the scenes of a *mystère mimé* on stationary *hourds* or platforms situated along the line of the Corpus Christi procession. Of the one in 1562 Petit de Julleville says (II, 214): "En 1562 il y eut 32 *hourds* . . . mais ce fut par des mannequins et non par personnages, que les diverses corporations représentèrent les scènes de la Passion. Cette sorte d'exhibition n'appartient plus du tout au drame." This statement is entirely erroneous; the scenes were given "par personnages." The error seems to be due to a misunderstanding of the statement of De la Fons-Mélicocq: "En 1562, c'était par 'des figures' que, sur les XXXII hourds érigés par les corps de métiers, on rappelait aux pieux catholiques toutes les phases des humiliations et des souffrances du Sauveur," although Didron had given the explanation: "Il faut entendre, par toutes ces *figures,* la représentation des faits de l'Ancien Testament, qui sont regardés comme des *images* du Nouveau." [18] Definite evidence that the scenes were given by persons is found in the fact that the three actors representing Christ and the good and bad thieves, having exhausting roles, were given each "une canne de vin," a form of compensation that is frequently mentioned in the Béthune records. Thus the scenes in 1562 differed from those in 1549 (Petit de Julleville, II, 212) by representing not the New Testament scenes alone, but these scenes, accompanied each by two "figures," or prefigurations, from the Old Testament as in the *Biblia Pauperum.*

NEIL C. BROOKS.

University of Illinois.

[18] See Mélicocq in the *Documents inédits* to which Petit de Julleville refers and also in *Annales Archéologiques,* VIII, 272; Didron in *Annales Arch.,* X, 249, also VIII, 274 (note 5).

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

MELÉNDEZ VALDÉS' *VANIDAD DE LAS QUEJAS DEL HOMBRE CONTRA SU HACEDOR* AND THE *PENSÉES* OF PASCAL

One of the most striking examples of the predominance of French ideas in Spanish literature of the eighteenth century, a condition due to the commanding place in European affairs then occupied by France, as well as to the political ties that bound Spain to her northern neighbor, is the influence of Pascal's *Pensées* on Meléndez Valdés' religious poem, *Vanidad de las Quejas del Hombre contra su Hacedor.*

The peculiar temperament of the Spanish poet explains the extent of his obligation. Of Juan Meléndez Valdés (1754-1817) Fitzmaurice-Kelly says: "Meléndez was a weather-cock at the mercy of every breeze. A writer of erotic verse, he thought of taking orders; a pastoral poet, he turned to philosophy by Jove-Llanos' advice; unfortunate in his marriage, discontented with his professorship at Salamanca, he dabbled in politics. . . . He typifies the fluctuations of his time. . . . 'Obra soy tuya,' he writes to Jove-Llanos. He was ever the handiwork of the last comer: a shadow of insincerity, of pose, is over all his works." [1]

It is easy to imagine such a man, fired by the reading of Pascal's masterpiece, rushing to his study, and there pouring out his heart in temporarily sincere, though borrowed, praise to the Creator.

The purpose of the Spanish poem is the same as that of the *Pensées,* to give man a just estimate of his position in the universe, to show him both his insignificance and his greatness, and to lead him thereby to an attitude of resignation and piety.

Pascal places man midway between nothingness and infinity. "Car, enfin, qu'est-ce que l'homme dans la nature?" he asks.[2] And the answer comes:

Un néant à l'égard de l'infini, un tout à l'égard du néant, un milieu entre rien et tout. Infiniment éloigné de comprendre les extrêmes, la fin des choses et leurs principes sont pour lui invinci-

[1] Fitzmaurice-Kelly, *A History of Spanish Literature* (New York and London, 1912), p. 358, 359.

[2] Pascal, *Œuvres,* ed. Brunschvicg, XII, 72-79 (Section II of the *Pensées*).

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

blement cachés dans un secret impénétrable, également incapable de voir le néant d'où il est tiré, et l'infini où il est englouti.

Meléndez says:

¿Del infinito en medio y de la nada
Qué es el hombre ignorante?

Man's position is, however, merely one expression of a universal system; all things share with him his evolution toward the infinite. Meléndez Valdés writes:

Las cosas todas en la nada nacen,
Y en lo infinito paran: quien las cría
Contará solo los guarismos que hacen.

Pascal had expressed the same thought thus:

Toutes choses sont sorties du néant et portées jusqu'à l'infini. Qui suivra ces étonnantes démarches? L'auteur de ces merveilles les comprend. Tout autre ne le peut faire.

Both authors urge man to lift his eyes to the infinite spaces of the heavens, and to consider the sun, compared with which our earth is only a tiny point. In the *Pensées* we find:

Qu'il (l'homme) éloigne sa vue des objets bas qui l'environnent. Qu'il regarde cette éclatante lumière, mise comme une lampe éternelle pour éclairer l'univers. Que la terre lui paraisse comme un point, au prix du vaste tour que cet astre décrit et qu'il s'étonne de ce que ce vaste tour lui-même n'est qu'une pointe très délicate à l'égard de celui que les astres qui roulent dans le firmament embrassent. . . . Que l'homme, étant revenu à soi, considère ce qu'il est au prix de ce qui est, qu'il se regarde comme égaré dans ce canton détourné de la nature; et que de ce petit cachot où il se trouve logé, j'entends l'univers, il apprenne à estimer la terre, les royaumes, les villes et soi-même son juste prix.

Meléndez says on this subject:

¡Hijo del polvo, si elevarla osas,
Alza la vista al cielo, y ve la esfera
De estrellas tachonada,
Todas a par hermosas!
¿Es solo para tí tanta lumbrera?
Acaso cada cual será empleada
En bañar con dorada
Llama como acá el sol, otro gran suelo;

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

Y los que el globo de Saturno moran,
Tan lejos como tú miran el cielo,
Y que tú habitas este punto ignoran.

Man having sufficiently convinced himself of his insignificance compared with the infinitely great, is now urged to turn his attention to the infinitely little.

Pascal develops the thought thus:

Qu'est-ce qu'un homme dans l'infini? Mais pour lui présenter un autre prodige aussi étonnant, qu'il recherche dans ce qu'il connaît les choses les plus délicates. Qu'un ciron lui offre dans la petitesse de son corps des parties incomparablement plus petites, des jambes avec des jointures, des veines dans ses jambes, du sang dans ses veines, des humeurs dans ce sang, des gouttes dans ses humeurs, des vapeurs dans ces gouttes; que, divisant encore ces dernières choses, il épuise ses forces en ces conceptions, et que le dernier objet où il peut arriver soit maintenant celui de notre discours; il pensera peut-être que c'est là l'extrême petitesse de la nature. Je veux lui faire voir là-dedans un abîme nouveau. Je lui veux peindre non seulement l'univers visible, mais l'immensité qu'on peut concevoir de la nature, dans l'enceinte de ce raccourci d'atome. Qu'il y voie une infinité d'univers, dont chacun a son firmament, ses planètes, sa terre, en la même proportion que le monde visible; dans cette terre, des animaux, et enfin des cirons, dans lesquels il retrouvera ce que les premiers ont donné; et trouvant encore dans les autres la même chose sans fin et sans repos, qu'il se perde dans ces merveilles, . . .

Meléndez follows his French original very closely:

Los ojos vuelve hacia la baja tierra,
Y a sus vivientes llega a tu despecho:
El más imperceptible
Mil otros en sí encierra.
Del mosquito sutil ¡Qué inmenso trecho
Al que apenas la lente hace visible!
¿Y acaso no es posible
Descender aun de aquel? pues él contiene
Dentro en sí otros, que a vivir dispone:
Cada cual movimiento y partes tiene,
Y cada parte de otras se compone.

Those parts of the Spanish poem which are not taken from the French consist of pious moralizing and paraphrases of the book of Job.

GILBERT M. FESS.

University of Pennsylvania.

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

A NEW DATE FOR GEORGE WILKINS'S *THREE MISERIES OF BARBARY*

George Wilkins has long interested scholars because of his share in *Pericles*[1] and of his possible collaboration in other plays of Shakespeare. Recently Mr. Wallace discovered evidence[2] showing that Wilkins was probably a personal acquaintance of Shakespeare; and Professor Adams has suggested[3] that he may be responsible for *The Hystorie of Hamblet.* A still further link between Wilkins and Shakespeare can be established by the redating of the *Three Miseries of Barbary,*[4] as proposed in this paper, for this redating carries an answer to a bibliographical question raised by the bad Shakespeare quartos of 1619.[5]

Scholars have heretofore conjectured that the *Three Miseries* was published in 1603 or 1604.[6] Although these dates are presumably based upon internal evidence, no one, so far as I know, has revealed the nature of that evidence. A careful examination of the text and a study of the bibliographical features involved show that the date cannot be earlier than 1606, and that it is in all probability 1607.

I. *The Internal Evidence.* The references to historical events may be divided, according to subject, into four groups: the death of the king of Morocco; civil wars in Barbary; civil wars in

[1] The latest and most thorough study of this problem is that of Mr. H. Dugdale Sykes, in *Sidelights on Shakespeare* (1919).

[2] In the Mountjoy Documents, reprinted in Nebraska *University Studies,* x (1910), 261.

[3] *A Life of William Shakespeare* (1923), 400 n.

[4] Three / Miseries of Barbary: / Plague. / Famine. / Ciuill warre. / With a relation of the death of Maha- / met the late Emperour: and a briefe / report of the now present Wars / betweene the three Brothers. / [Device: the Half Eagle and Key] / Printed by W. I. for Henry Gosson, and are to be sold / in Pater noster rowe at the signe of the Sunne. / 4to, black letter, 15 leaves. British Museum 1046. d. 24.

The preface is signed "Geo. Wilkins."

[5] See A. W. Pollard, *Shakespeare Folios and Quartos* (1909).

[6] Hazlitt (*Hand-Book,* 656), 1603; Collier, *Bibliographical Account of Early English Literature,* IV, 262), 1602-3; Sir Sidney Lee (*Dictionary of National Biography,* art. George Wilkins), 1604; H. D. Sykes (*Sidelights on Shakespeare,* 78 and 144), 1603.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

France and the Low Countries; and freedom from plague, famine, and civil war in England.

The death of the king of Morocco is referred to in the following passages:

Titlepage: Three Miseries of Barbary: Plague. Famine. Ciuill warre. With a relation of the death of Mahamet the *late*[7] Emperour. . . .
D 1 recto: The Pestilence . . . did at the last set upon the Emperour Mahamet himselfe, and with her venemous breath kild him.

This Mahamet, or, as he was commonly called, El-Mansour, died of the plague August 20, 1603.[8] But there is no reason to assume that the word *late* in the passage quoted from the title-page could not be properly employed at a date later than 1603, or even 1604. Dekker, referring in 1606 to the plague of 1602-3 and to the death of Queen Elizabeth (March 24, 1603), uses the same word: "What miseries haue of *late* ouertaken thee?"[9]

Civil Wars in Barbary. The passages which refer to the civil strife in Barbary are:

Titlepage: With a relation of the death of Mahamet the late Emperour: and a briefe report of the *now present* Wars betweene the three Brothers.
B 3 recto: Betweene these three [brothers, sons of the king of Morocco] were these *late* ciuell warres in Barbary.
D 2 verso: The three sonnes of so great an Emperour, shine *now* like three Meteors in the firmament, all in steele, their Courts *now* are Campes, and none are Courtiers but Souldiers. Three Brothers beeing all three kings, are up in Armes, only to make of three but one, miseries upon miserie.
D 3 recto: This fire of Discention hath *now* taken holde of Barbarie. . . .

In the second quotation above Wilkins was doubtless using the word *late* in the sense in which Dekker used it in his *Seven Deadly Sins*; by the word *now* in the other quotations he refers to a civil strife which began, it is true, in 1603, but which continued until at least 1610.[10]

[7] Here and in subsequent quotations italics mine.

[8] C. Huart, *Histoire des Arabes* (Paris, 1913), II, 218: "El-Mançoûr fut emporté l'année suivante par la peste qui régnait dans le Maghreb, le mercredi 11 rébî 'I 1012 (20 août 1603)."

[9] *The Seuen deadly Sinnes of London*, Grosart, II, 11.

[10] Edward Grimston, in Richard Knolles's *The Generall Historie of the Turkes* (5th ed., 1638), 1301, recording the events of the year 1610, says: "There was a warre fallen out in Barbary betwixt Muley Xequy, King

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

Civil Wars in France and the Low Countries.

D 2 verso: O noble France, if I should bid thee onely to tell the horror, the terrors, the unbounded mischiefe and calamity that come marching in with intestiue [*sic*] Broyles, thou needest to say nothing, but to open thy bosome, and shew those deepe scars which thine owne sons haue set there. There are tears *yet* in thine eyes, for those sad funeralls which the Ciuill sworde prepared. The Low-Countries haue beene in labour a long time, and are *not yet* deliuered of that Monster.

As late as 1609, in "A Prayer in time of ciuill warre,"[11] Dekker refers to the same circumstances:

"We haue beene (O Lord) a long time lookers on vpon our neighbour-contreyes, and haue seene their cities turned to cinders, yet haue not beene scorched with the flames. *France doeth yet mourne in the ashes of those fires, and Germany*[12] *is evẽ now stiffled with the smoaks.*"

Freedom from plague, famine, and civil war in England. Wilkins makes much of the point that England, even though more sinful than Barbary, is free from the punishments that are being suffered by the inhabitants of Barbary.

The Epistle: The chiefe and farthest point that my intention seeks to arriue at in this, is to describe the horrour and vn-heard-of misery that hath falne vpon that Kingdome by a Plague: to the intent that by comparing our sins with theirs (being altogether as greet if not greater) and *the hand of mercy which Heauen hath stretcht forth ouer our Nation, aboue theirs,* we may be allured to looke into our soules betimes, *least the like Viols of Wrath bee powred downe vppon vs.*

Obviously Wilkins is contrasting the deplorable plight of Barbary with the happy state of England; but if he were referring merely to the plague, he could not make such a contrast, because the plague in Barbary occurred in the same year as that in England, 1603. The "like Viols of Wrath," then, are the punishments which *followed* the plague og 1603,—famine and civil war, the latter of which, as I have said, lasted in Barbary as late as 1610, and did not exist in England.

of Fez, and Muley Sidan his younger brother. . . ." These are two of the three brothers referred to by Wilkins in his pamphlet.

[11] *Foure Birdes of Noahs Arke*, Grosart, v, 57. For a similar reference in 1606 see Dekker's *Seven Deadly Sins*, Grosart, II, 9-10.

[12] "With Dekker, 'Germany' often means the Netherlands."—M. L. Hunt, *Thomas Dekker*, 24.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

This interpretation of the foregoing passage is substantiated by the following:

D 4 recto: Our *late* calamities infliced [*sic.*] upon us for our sinnes are *fresh in memory*, the eyes of many people are *yet* wet with mourning at burials, the rod is *stil* held ouer us, the stripes of it are euen *nowe* to be seene sticking in our flesh. Yet you see howe the Great Father of Nations, keepes us under his wing, he is loth to chide, more loath to strike us, let us not therefore, like foolish haire-braind children, prouoke him too often, and too much to anger, *least he take up his triple Mace of hote vengeance, and with it bruze our people, as hee hath already stretcht out his Arme to smite those of Barberie.*

The "triple Mace of hote vengeance" is, of course, the combination of plague, famine, and civil war, only the first of which England had had to endure.

It might be objected that the words *late, still, yet, now* indicate that the pamphlet was written in the year in which the plague occurred, or at latest in the year following; and the phrase *fresh in memory* might serve to make this objection convincing. I have already referred to Dekker's use of the word *late* three years after the occurrence of the events to which he was referring; in the same year, 1606, referring to the plague of 1602-3, Dekker[13] uses precisely the same phrase that Wilkins here employs:

Heere could I make thee weepe thy selfe away into, waters by calling back those sad and dismall houres, wherein thou consumedst almost to nothing with shrikes and lamentations, in that Wonderfull yeere, when these miserable calamities entred in at thy Gates, slaying 30000. and more as thou heldst them in thine armes; but they are *fresh in thy memory*. . . .

If there were no other evidence than that already examined, we should need nothing further to convince us that the pamphlet might have been written at least three or four years after 1603. But there is one more bit of evidence in the *Epistle* of the *Three Miseries* which clinches the matter: Wilkins informs the reader that he has brought together some of "the best and maine occurents which haue *now lately* (and *not many yeares past*) hapned in Barbary," emphasizing, by marks of parenthesis, his phrase "not many *yeares* past."

II. *The External Evidence.* From the evidence thus far examined, it is safe to assume that the *Three Miseries of Barbary*

[13] *The Seuen deadly Sinnes of London*, Grosart, II, 12.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

was not published in 1603 or 1604, and that it was probably published at least three or four years later. There is external evidence which not only substantiates this conclusion, but makes practically certain the year 1607 as the date of publication.

The Period of Wilkins's Literary Activity. The other works for which Wilkins is known to have been in whole or in part responsible were all published in the years 1607 and 1608. These works, with dates of publication, are: *The Miseries of Enforced Marriage,* 1607; *The Travels of the Three English Brothers,*[14] 1607; *Jests To Make You Merie,*[15] 1607; the novel *Pericles,* 1608. There is no record that Wilkins wrote as early as 1603; and since three of the four works upon which his name appears were published in 1607, there is at least a presumption that the *Three Miseries* may have been published in the same year.

The Printer. We come now to the most important part of the evidence. Upon the titlepage of the *Three Miseries of Barbary* appears the device of the Half Eagle and Key, the arms of the city of Geneva.[16] The imprint tells us that the printer was "W. I." Hazlitt[17] and Sir Sidney Lee[18] conjecture that these initials stand for William Jones, but there is no evidence that Jones ever used the Half Eagle and Key device. That William Jaggard owned the device is, however, well known. According to Mr. Pollard,[19] Jaggard seems to have used the device fairly often after 1610; he used it notably in 1619, upon the titlepage of his quarto of *A Midsummer Night's Dream.*

Although the device apparently passed from James Roberts to Jaggard in 1606, when Jaggard bought Roberts's printing business in the Barbican, neither Mr. Pollard nor Mr. McKerrow has discovered any evidence that Jaggard used the block[20] before 1617,

[14] The dedication is signed by John Day, William Rowley, and George Wilkins. Reprinted by A. H. Bullen in *The Works of John Day* (1881).

[15] By "T. D. and George Wilkins." Reprinted in Grosart's *The Non-Dramatic Works of Thomas Dekker,* II.

[16] For the history of this device see A. W. Pollard, *Shakespeare Folios and Quartos* (1909), 105; and R. B. McKerrow, *Printers' and Publishers' Devices* (1913), 49.

[17] *Ibid.,* 656.

[18] Introduction to Facsimile of *Pericles* (1905), 21.

[19] *Ibid.,* 106.

[20] In 1609 Jaggard used the design of the Half Eagle and Key device as part of the ornamental border to Heywood's *Troia Britannica.*

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

when the device appeared at the end of *A godly Sermon preached in 1388.*

There is, however, evidence that Jaggard used the block before 1617—on the titlepage of George Wilkins's *The Miseries of Enforced Marriage,*[21] published in 1607. Although the imprint gives neither the name nor the initials of the printer, it is certain that the play was printed by Jaggard: the impression made by the device shows the same flaws and irregularities which appear in the impression of this device upon the titlepage of Jaggard's quarto of *A Midsummer Night's Dream.* But this is not all. The ornamental headpiece[22] to the titlepage of *The Miseries* is the same as that used by Jaggard on five of the bad quartos of 1619.[23] The tailpiece of *The Miseries* is the headpiece to the titlepage of Jaggard's quarto of *A Midsummer Night's Dream,* and the headpiece to the first page of text of his quarto of *Henry Fifth.* And there is still another link between *The Miseries of Enforced Marriage* and Jaggard's known work: the ornamental headpiece to the first page of text corresponds to the headpiece of the titlepage of Jaggard's quarto of *Henry Fifth.*

Thus it is certain that Jaggard printed *The Miseries of Enforced Marriage* in 1607, using the device of the Half Eagle and Key. I shall now show that he printed also the *Three Miseries of Barbary.*

The titlepage of this pamphlet has the same device, the Half Eagle and Key, with the same irregularities, that Jaggard used upon the titlepages of *The Miseries of Enforced Marriage, A Midsummer Night's Dream,* and *The Plain Man's Pathway.* The tailpiece of the *Three Miseries* is the tailpiece of *Henry Fifth.* The *Finis* of the *Three Miseries* is the *Finis* of Jaggard's quartos of *King Lear* and *The Whole Contention,* Part I. The ornamental headpiece to the dedication of the *Three Miseries* is the headpiece to the titlepage of *Henry Fifth,* and to the first page of text of *The Miseries of Enforced Marriage.* And finally, types from the same three fonts are used in the *Three Miseries of Barbary* and

[21] See Mr. John S. Farmer's reproduction of this text in *The Tudor Facsimile Texts.*

[22] The Royal Arms: Honi soit qui mal y pense.

[23] *King Lear, Pericles, Henry Fifth, The Merchant of Venice, The Whole Contention,* Part II. See the *Shakspere Quarto Facsimiles,* by W. Griggs and C. Praetorius.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

The Miseries of Enforced Marriage to make up titlepages which bear a striking resemblance to each other.

Unquestionably, then, the "W. I." of the *Three Miseries* imprint stands for William Jaggard.

I have thus shown (1) that Jaggard used the Half Eagle and Key device in 1607, and (2) that he printed the *Three Miseries of Barbary*. Since James Roberts did not sell his printing business to Jaggard until 1606, Jaggard could not have used the Half Eagle and Key device before that year; therefore he could not have printed the *Three Miseries of Barbary* before 1606. And since he used the device on Wilkins's *The Miseries of Enforced Marriage* in 1607, it is probable that he used it on Wilkins's *Three Miseries of Barbary* in the same year. This date seems the more likely when we consider that, with one exception (the novel *Pericles*), all of Wilkins's other known works were published in 1607.

Guy Shepard Greene.

Cornell University.

REVIEWS

Nature's Simple Plan: a Phase of Radical Thought in the Mid-Eighteenth Century. By Chauncey Brewster Tinker. Princeton: Princeton University Press. London: Humphrey Milford, Oxford University Press. 1922. Pp. vi, 117.

The four lectures which make up this little book were originally delivered at Princeton University on the Louis Clark Vanuxem Foundation. They deal with various aspects of the "theory of simplicity — the way of Nature — in the England of 1770": the attack upon luxury, with its corollary that "civilisation had somehow or other failed of its goal"; the influence of the explorations of the 'sixties and 'seventies in arousing interest in the "primitive" peoples of the South Seas; the furor caused by the coming to London of Omai, the South Sea Islander, and of Captain Cartwright's Esquimaux; the speculations of Lord Monboddo; the enthusiasm of liberals for Corsica, and the disillusionment which followed the conquest of that island by the French; the interest in "ancient bards" and in "peasant poets."

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

Like Professor Tinker's other writings on the eighteenth century, these lectures have the merit of being well written and genuinely entertaining. They can be recommended wholeheartedly to the general reader, for whom, indeed, they would seem to have been written, and whom they cannot fail to infect with some of their author's enthusiasm for his favorite period. Nor will they be entirely thrown away on the professional scholar, who, unless his documentation is more exhaustive than that of most of us, will be grateful for the many references to obscure texts—on the South Seas, on Corsica, on the preparation for Burns—which Professor Tinker's wide reading has enabled him to supply.

For all its freshness and charm, however, the book is somewhat disappointing. It would be unfair, of course, to lay too much stress upon the inadequacy of the treatment of many topics, upon the occasional lack of precision or accuracy in references and dates, or upon the somewhat haphazard character of the illustrative details, the result rather of chance reading or of Professor Tinker's earlier studies of Boswell and Johnson than of anything like a methodical exploration of the available sources; for the book is not intended as a scholarly monograph, but merely as a series of suggestive essays on a movement of thought that has a very definite significance for the present day. The really serious fault of the volume is a fault of perspective: Professor Tinker greatly exaggerates the novelty and importance of many of the phenomena with which he deals. As this is a defect which his book has in common with many more pretentious works on the later eighteenth century, there can be no harm in dwelling briefly upon some of its manifestations.

The thesis developed in the first and third lectures ("The State of Nature" and "Ancient Bard and Gentle Savage") is perhaps best stated in the words of Boswell's *Hypochondriack* which serve as a motto to the first lecture: "The difference between the savage and civilised state of man has been much considered of late years, since so many discoveries of distant regions and new nations have been made under his present majesty's patronage, and since an eloquent writer upon the continent and even a learned judge who is an author in our own island have thought fit to maintain the superiority of the former." Taking his cue from this passage, Professor Tinker insists, justly enough, upon the importance of

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

the voyages of the 'sixties and 'seventies in furnishing fresh stimulus and fresh material to the idealizers of primitive man; but he errs, as does Boswell, in forgetting that the enthusiasm aroused by these voyages constituted merely a new phase[1] of a development that had been continuous in Europe since the sixteenth century. A striking example of the false perspective resulting from this neglect of the earlier stages of the movement appears on p. 73. Here, apropos of the savage youth of Chili mentioned by Gray in the *Progress of Poesy* (wr. 1754), Professor Tinker writes: "With this figure it was far more difficult to deal than with the ancient bard because there was a total lack of acquaintance with the religion, folk-lore, and customs of the Malay, the African, and the American. The idealisation of the redskin belongs to a later generation."[2] Whatever may have been the case with the Malay or the African, the portion of this statement that concerns the American Indian is clearly the precise opposite of the truth. Professor Chinard, with whose books Professor Tinker seems not to be acquainted, has put the matter beyond question for France;[3] and though we have as yet no studies comparable to his for England, it would not be difficult to draw up a long list of publications extending far back into the seventeenth century, in which eulogies of the natural virtues of the savages were combined with descriptions, some of them very elaborate, of their "religion, folklore, and customs."[4] In short, all the evidence points to the conclu-

[1] Its newness, however, must not be exaggerated, for there are traces of idealization in a number of earlier accounts of voyages to the South Seas. See Dampier, *A New Voyage round the World*, London, 1697 (in *A Collection of Voyages*, London, 1729, I, 432-34); W. Funnell, *A Voyage round the World*, London, 1707 (*ibid.*, IV, 154, 159-60); and R. Walter, *A Voyage round the World in the Years MDCCXL, etc., by George Anson, Esq.*, second edition, London, 1748, pp. 411-22, 453.

[2] In his note to this passage, it is true, Professor Tinker acknowledges that the tradition of the "sentimentalised savage" was at least as old in England as Florio, but in the main body of his text he gives a very different impression. Cf. p. 64.

[3] In his *L'exotisme américain dans la littérature française au XVIe siècle* (Paris, 1911) and in his *L'Amérique et le rêve exotique dans la littérature française au XVIIe et au XVIIIe siècle* (Paris, 1913).

[4] A very incomplete list of such publications, including both original English works and translations, is as follows: J. Acosta, *The naturall and morall Historie of the East and West Indies*, London, 1604 (in Book

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

sion that there was no "sudden revival of interest" in primitive man in the second half of the eighteenth century, but merely an extension and intensification, under somewhat changed conditions,

VI the author proposes to "confute that false opinion many doe commonly holde of them [the Indians], that they are a grose and brutish people"); M. Lescarbot, *Nova Francia: or the Description of that Part of New France, which is one continent with Virginia*, London, 1609 (cf. Chinard, *L'Amérique et le rêve exotique*, pp. 109-14); LasCasas, *The Tears of the Indians . . .* , London, 1656; other translations appeared in 1689 and 1699; Rochefort, *The History of Barbados . . .* , London, 1666 (see especially Book II, Chs. VIII and XI, and cf. Chinard, *L'Amérique*, pp. 54-57); Jean Mocquet, *Travels and Voyages into Africa, Asia, and America*, London, 1696 (cf. pp. 58, 72, 124-27); Lahontan, *New Voyages to North-America*, London, 1703; second edition, 1735 (cf. Chinard, *L'Amérique*, pp. 167-86); Robert Beverly, *The History and Present State of Virginia*, London, 1705; second edition, 1722 (Book III: "Of the Indians, their Religion, Laws, and Customs, in War and Peace"; conclusion (p. 63): "Thus I have given a succinct account of the *Indians;* happy, I think, in their simple State of Nature, and in their enjoyment of Plenty, without the Curse of Labour"); John Lawson, *A New Voyage to Carolina*, London, 1709; reprinted, 1714 and 1718 (cf. p. 177: the Indians are "some of the sweetest People in the World"; p. 197: they never envy other men's happiness, but have "something Valuable in themselves above Riches"; p. 235: they are "Patient under all Afflictions, and have a great many other Natural Vertues"); Lafitau, *Mœurs des sauvages amériquains*, Paris, 1724 (cf. Chinard, *L'Amérique*, pp. 315-26; apparently not translated, but widely read in England in the original: see *New Memoirs of Literature*, I [1725], 176-84, 241-56; Malcolme, *Essay on the Antiquities of Great Britain and Ireland* [1738]; Brown, *Dissertation on . . . Poetry and Music* [1763], pp. 29-36, 51, 62, 119; Percy, *Reliques* [1765], ed. Schröer, Berlin, 1893, II, 536; and Monboddo, *Of the Origin and Progress of Language* [1773-1792], IV, 41); B. Picart, *The Ceremonies and Religious Customs of the various Nations of the known World*, London, 1733-1739 (cf. III, 39: Indian poetry; 60-62: the Indians "follow nature more closely than we"; 67-69: their love of country); *A New Voyage to Georgia*, second edition, London, 1737 (cf. pp. 57-60: the virtues of the Indians which make them good subjects for conversion); C. Colden, *The History of the Five Indian Nations of Canada*, London, 1747 (enlarged from a work with a similar title printed at New York in 1727; describes the laws, customs, religious beliefs, and eloquence of the Indians; eulogizes their love of country, bravery, hospitality, and passion for liberty).—The poems in praise of the South Sea Islanders, of which Professor Tinker gives a partial list (pp. 10-11, 17, 87-88), had analogues in the first half of the century in a number of pieces inspired by the prevailing enthusiasm for the Indians: cf. for example, "The Happy Savage," in the *Gentleman's*

Digitized by Google | Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

of an interest which had taken definite form several generations before.[5]

Though this is perhaps the most important instance of Professor Tinker's failure to place the facts with which he deals in their proper historical perspective, it is not the only one. The true significance, for example, of the enthusiastic reception given to Omai, the South Sea Islander brought to London in 1774 (pp. 75-88), would stand out more clearly if we were enabled to view his visit as simply one in a long series of similar visits which from the beginning of the century had afforded Englishmen a first-hand acquaintance with individual savages.[6] So too with the

Magazine, II (1732), 718; Pope, *Essay on Man*, Ep. I (1733), ll. 99-112; Samuel Wesley (?), *Tomo Chachi, an Ode* (1736); and Joseph Warton, *The Enthusiast* (1744), ll. 232-44.

[5] It is hardly correct to say, as Professor Tinker does, on p. 88, that the "noble savage" was the "offspring of the rationalism of the Deist philosophers, who, in their attack upon the Christian doctrine of the fall of man, had idealised the child of Nature." Not only did many of the most influential leaders of the Deist movement (Bolingbroke and Voltaire, for example) look upon the savages as far from ideal creatures, but the conception of the "noble savage" was itself fully formed long before Deism became a distinguishable movement. The influences under which it took shape are many of them still obscure, but the most important, aside from the universal human tendency to idealize the past and the strange, would seem to have been the popularity in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries of the medieval theme of the Terrestrial Paradise and still more of the classical theme of the Golden Age, the image of the simple life of the Hebrew patriarchs and of the primitive Christians, the vogue of Sparta and republican Rome, and the general inquietude which Europeans increasingly felt under the pressure of a civilization that was ever becoming more sophisticated and complex (see Chinard, *L'exotisme américain*, pp. xvi, 7-9, 11, 19, 26, 118, 120, 204, 245-46; *L'Amérique et le rêve exotique*, pp. 97, 431; and P. Van Tieghem, "L'homme primitif et ses vertus dans le Préromantisme européen," in *Bulletin de la société d'histoire moderne*, June, 1922, p. 215). Minds dominated by sentiments such as these were predisposed to take an optimistic view of primitive humanity, and it required only the contact with America to crystallize their vague feelings into a definite conception. It is interesting to recall, in view of Professor Tinker's theory, that the elaboration of this conception was in very large part the work, not of philosophers of any school, but of the Jesuit missionaries in New France (see Chinard, *L'Amérique*, pp. 122-50, 313-40).

[6] It is sufficient to refer to the visits of four Iroquois chiefs in 1710 (see *The Four Kings of Canada. Being a succinct account of the Four Indian Princes lately arriv'd from North America*, London, 1710, and cf. *Tatler*,

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

theories of Lord Monboddo: his belief in the progressive decline of civilization (pp. 20-22) can be understood aright only when it is seen in relation to much earlier views on the "declining state of the world," of which it was merely a late survivor.[7] These are sins of omission, and they can be forgiven in view of the popular and unpretentious character of the book in general. A more serious matter is Professor Tinker's treatment of what he terms the "very remarkable novelties" of Gray's *Progress of Poesy* (pp. 63-64). After quoting the well-known passage in which Gray sketches the "influence of poetic genius over the remotest and most uncivilised nations" (II, 2), he comments as follows: "Lapland and Chili in 1754! All this, we may well remind ourselves, is nearly twenty years before that renewal of interest in primitive man which ensued upon the explorations of the 'sixties, and which was discussed in the first of these lectures." The exclamation, however, is unnecessary, for, aside from the general fact that interest in Lapland and American, as well as in other forms of "primitive" poetry, was no new thing in 1754,[8] the whole content of Gray's stanza and of his accompanying note is exactly paralleled in a work published more than twenty years previously. "Poetry," wrote John Husbands in 1731, "was not confin'd [in early times] only to the politer Nations. We may find some Remains of it among the most uncultivated People, and trace its Footsteps even beneath the Pole. The frozen *Laplander* is susceptible of this Fire, as well as the Sunburnt *American*. . . ."[9]

Other instances of the same tendency to neglect earlier developments might be pointed out, but these are perhaps sufficient to indicate wherein lies the chief weakness, for scholars, of Professor Tinker's interesting book. It is a weakness, let us hope, which in the future will be less apparent in writings on the later eighteenth

No. 171 and *Spectator*, No. 50), of seven Cherokee chiefs in 1730 (see V. W. Crane, in *The Sewanee Review*, January-March, 1919, p. 53), and of a group of Creek Indians in 1734 (see *Gentleman's Magazine*, IV, 449, 450, 571).

[7] See R. F. Jones, "The Background of the 'Battle of the Books,'" in *Washington University Studies*, Vol. VII, Humanistic series (1920), pp. 104-16, and, on the classical origins of the idea, J. B. Bury, *The Idea of Progress* (London, 1921), Ch. I.

[8] See *Mod. Lang. Notes*, XXXVII (1922), 35.

[9] *Ibid.*, p. 30.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

century than it has been in the past. In no period, of course, can we afford to shut our eyes to what has gone before, but there are few periods in which forgetfulness of the immediate or remote past is more fatal to an intelligent understanding of what was taking place than in that with which we are concerned in this book.

RONALD S. CRANE.

Northwestern University.

Les premières actrices françaises. Par LEOPOLD LACOUR. 8 gravures hors texte. Paris: Librairie française, 1921. 229 pp.

While in England French actresses were being "hissed, hooted, and pippin-pelted,"[1] they were establishing themselves in France as a permanent and increasingly important part of the troop. As much of the progress towards the commanding position they occupy today was made during the reign of Louis XIII, it was desirable that some one should devote a special study to those of them who gained recognition before he ceased to reign. M. Lacour has brought to the subject his very considerable knowledge of the stage, a charming style, and much ingenuity in putting together fragmentary information into a work that is highly entertaining and, in its principal elements, true. He has even endeavored to affirm nothing that will expose him "au démenti brutal d'un nouveau texte inédit" (p. 9), but here he has not altogether succeeded. While indicating the main subjects that he treats, I shall try to add a little information that he has overlooked and to correct a few of his details.

The first actress he mentions is Marie Ferré, who signed a contract at Bourges in 1545 to play in a strolling troop. He is careful not to assert that she was actually the first, and fortunately, for M. Cohen has recently shown that a girl named Waudru played in a mystery of 1501.[2] As there is very little information to be had about actresses of the sixteenth century, he soon passes on to the seventeenth and devotes a chapter to Marie Venier, dite Laporte,

[1] Prynne's *Histriomastix*, cited by Collier, *History of English Dramatic Poetry*, London, John Murray, 1831, II, 23.

[2] "Le livre du régisseur pour le Mystère de la Passion," *R. d. d. m.*, 15 mai 1923, p. 415.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

the first Parisian actress of whom we have any record,[3] and her sister Colombe, who was probably the mother of Montfleury. Some attention is paid to Italian actresses who performed in France, especially to Isabella Andreini.[4] He thinks that Le Noir, famed for her "douceurs et gaillardises qui la rendent agréable à tout le monde," may have created the rôle of Thisbé in Théophile's tragedy. He is on surer ground when he refers to Villiers and Beauchâteau as the creators of the rôles of Chimène and l'Infante in the *Cid.* To these, to Valliot, Beaupré, La Fleur and other actresses he pays considerable attention, especially to Bellerose, wife of the leader of the troop established at the Hôtel de Bourgogne and called by Tallemant the best actress in Paris.[5]

The chief criticism I have to make of this portion of the book is that he often assumes, without sufficient evidence, that a certain woman played a certain rôle.[6] One case deserves special attention. In seeking to determine what rôles were taken by Mlle Bellerose, M. Lacour (p. 126) cites a mazarinade of 1649, in which reference is made to "cette Cléopâtre, cette Rodogune, cette Impératrice de nos jours." It has been suggested that the plays referred to are Corneille's two tragedies, *Pompée* and *Rodogune,* and the conclusion has been drawn that the latter play was first acted at the Hôtel de Bourgogne. M. Lacour follows Marty-Laveaux[7] both in accepting this suggestion as far as *Rodogune* is concerned, and in arguing that the Cléopâtre mentioned is the heroine of Benserade's play of that name, first acted fourteen years before and now presumably revived to furnish a rival to the heroine of *Pompée.* But M. Lacour has overlooked the fact that, as *Pompée* had been printed in 1644, there was nothing to prevent its being acted by the troop of the Hôtel

[3] He thinks that "selon toute probabilité" there were scarcely any actresses at Paris before the reign of Henry IV, though they had long been applauded in the provinces (p. 5), but he gives no proof of this distinction.

[4] He might have called attention to the poem addressed to her by Isaac Du Ryer, in which he reminds her that "Paris vaut bien l'Italie." Cf. *Le Temps perdu,* Paris, 1610.

[5] To the information given about her he might have added that Mahelot requires for the playing of *La Florice* by Passar "une lettre a Mademoiselle de Bellerose," which shows her importance in the troop and that she was acting at the Hôtel de Bourgogne early in 1634.

[6] Cf. pp. 78, 84, 140.

[7] *Œuvres de P. Corneille,* IV, 56; cf. also 407.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

de Bourgogne, and, indeed, the second list of plays in the *Mémoire de Mahelot,*[8] which gives the repertory of the Hôtel de Bourgogne in 1646-1647, mentions *Pompée* and *Rodogune,* but says nothing about the *Cléopâtre* of Benserade. Mlle Bellerose must have been known in 1649, then, as the heroine of Corneille's recent and famous tragedy rather than of Benserade's antiquated play. On the other hand, the rôle of Rodogune, if it is that of an empress, as the mazarinade implies, must come from the *Rodogune* of Gabriel Gilbert, rather than from Corneille's tragedy of the same name and theme, for in the latter play Rodogune is a young princess, not an empress as in the former. Since these two plays were obviously written for rival theatres, one must conclude that, contrary to the general opinion, Corneille's *Rodogune* was first played, like most, if not all its predecessors, at the Marais. If Mlle Bellerose played in it at all, it was probably several years later,[9] when Gilbert's play had been withdrawn and Corneille's introduced into the repertory of the Hôtel de Bourgogne. And when she did, she probably took the part of the empress, not that of Rodogune.

M. Lacour holds that, as early as 1615, there were no troops in France without several actresses (p. 28). If this is so, how does he explain the assertion that the *suivante,* played by a woman, did not replace the *nourrice,* played by a man, till some 15 years later?[10] The dates assigned to plays by Mairet and Corneille (pp. 59, 71-77) are too precise for the evidence at our disposal. It is misleading to give to Hardy's plays, even with question marks, the absurd dates of the frères Parfaict (p. 194). *Sophonisbe* is said not to figure in the *Mémoire de Mahelot* (p. 81). It could not be included in the first list of plays given there, which was completed before this play was acted, but it is included in the second, that of 1646-47, and may have formed part of the repertory of the Hôtel de Bourgogne long before that date. The third list in *Mahelot* confirms M. Lacour's opinion that Tristan's *Mariane* was ultimately played at the Hôtel de Bourgogne (p. 92). The argument for

[8] Cf. my edition, Paris, Champion, 1920, pp. 50-56.

[9] It is idle to argue, as Marty-Laveaux does, that Gilbert's play must have been forgotten five years after it was acted, for Mahelot shows us that the same author's *Téléphonte* was still in the repertory of the Hôtel de Bourgogne at least that long after it was first played.

[10] Cf. the preface to Corneille's *Galerie du palais.*

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

dating the first representation of *Pyrame* 1625, even if it has the approval of M. Lachèvre (p. 52), is far from convincing. The fact that it appeared in a *recueil* proves nothing at all for this period. We certainly know too little about plays that were acted and printed between 1620 and 1625 to assume that a play that had been represented was always published "dans un volume qu'elle remplissait entièrement avec les 'proses' ou les vers qui la concernaient." Théophile, like Hardy, had written for the stage before he published the bulk of his work. It is probable that *Pyrame* was one of these plays and I see no objection to accepting for its date 1621, a year in which Théophile was in favor at court and which would allow for the usual period that elapsed between the representation and publication of a play.

After discussing the actresses, M. Lacour treats of the first *spectatrices,* the interest taken in the theater by the queen [11] and other great ladies, and the manner of acting and reciting during the period beginning with 1630 when there was a marked improvement in the quality of plays and of acting so that "les femmes les plus chastes et modestes" came freely to the theaters of Paris. He believes that the elocution was much less declamatory than later writers, especially Molière and Voltaire, have led us to suppose. Here, as elsewhere, the work is full of interesting suggestions, supported by considerable documentary evidence. The book, in spite of much that is conjectural, can be profitably consulted by specialists and will represent to the general public an interesting chapter, not only in the history of the stage, but in that of the development of feminism, for here we find women early in the seventeenth century taking a more important position in one department of human activity than she occupies even today in many others.

H. Carrington Lancaster.

---

[11] Like Dr. van Roosbroeck (*The Purpose of Corneille's Cid*, Minneapolis, 1921, 20-24), though independently, M. Lacour believes that Corneille was made a noble at the request of Anne of Austria, but M. Batiffol has more recently opposed this opinion, holding that in 1637 the queen "n'était en mesure de solliciter pareille faveur ni pour Corneille ni pour personne"; cf. "Richelieu a-t-il persécuté Corneille," *R. d. d. m.*, 1 avril 1923, pp. 634, 641, 642.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

Geschichte der deutschen Literatur in ihren Grundzügen. Von O. E. Lessing. Dresden: Carl Reissner, 1921. 345 pp.

Although some three years have elapsed since the appearance of this work, written in German and published abroad, but coming from the pen of an American scholar who for more than twenty years has expounded German literature in American higher institutions of learning, it has received but scant notice in this country. Hence it is felt that even at this comparatively late date some remarks on the book may not be out of place.

A new history of German literature at this time evokes first of all the question: What specific purpose prompted the author to write? The fact that the book lacks even the semblance of a critical apparatus and deals after all in a cursory manner with its subject shows that it was not intended primarily as a scholarly contribution. Nor is it certain that its author meant it to be used as an academic reference work; it is doubtful whether in America, at least, it could be made to fit into the scheme of an ordinary survey course.[1] Most probably, then, it was planned as a general treatise for the lay reading public.

The title of the book is rather misleading. While professing to be a *Geschichte der deutschen Literatur in ihren Grundzügen,* it stops short at Goethe's death without a word of explanation anywhere. It would be absurd to assume that Professor Lessing considers German literature as ending at that period. Not only has the author previously shown an interest in more recent literature (*Grillparzer und das neuere Drama,* 1905, and *Masters in Modern German Literature,* 1912), but in the very book under discussion he makes repeated and favorable reference to later authors and movements. Or is a second supplementary volume to appear later? If so, this should have been noted. Whatever the facts may be, the failure to indicate in a proper place that the book ends with the year 1832 is indefensible from a scientific point of view and unfair to the unsuspecting purchaser.[2]

[1] A special edition of the book appeared simultaneously for America, but textually it is identical with the original edition.

[2] Wilhelm Scherer could hardly be cited as a precedent here. He states in the preface to his *Geschichte der deutschen Literatur:* "Das vorliegende Buch erzählt die Geschichte der deutschen Literatur von den ältesten Zeiten bis auf Goethes Tod." Furthermore Scherer, writing some forty

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

A preface is lacking, and the only clues to the nature of the work are in the descriptive phrase of the title, *in ihren Grundzügen,* and the Shakespearean motto from *Coriolanus,* II, 3:

> What custom wills, in all things should we do't,
> The dust on antique time would lie unswept,
> The mountainous error be too highly heaped
> For truth to o'er-peer.

This is quoted in German. But the reader who concludes from the motto that the book presents its subject from any polemic, iconoclastic or essentially new angle will be disappointed. On the whole the treatment is quite conventional and follows well beaten tracks.

Professor Lessing begins his work with the migration of nations, the christianization of "Germany" and the oldest monuments. However, Wulfila is mentioned only twice, in a most casual way (pp. 10, 12), and the significance of his Gothic Bible as the oldest Germanic document is not touched upon. Tacitus is referred to only in connection with Klopstock's *Bardiete* (p. 155). The *Merseburger Zaubersprüche* and the *Wessobrunner Gebet* are not treated, while the importance of the cycles of *Volkssagen* and *Märchen* is scarcely alluded to.

Professor Lessing's method of giving information and his selection of facts seem rather arbitrary and eclectic. In the early chapters, for instance, he devotes very little attention to the manuscripts, their provenience and present location. Thus little or nothing along these lines is said about the *Hildebrandslied,* the *Heliand, Muspilli* and Otfried, but when we reach the *Carmina Burana* (p. 37), this question is dealt with. Mention of the so-called Archipoeta in connection with the *Carmina Burana* is misleading. He is rarely mentioned at all in books of this scope.

When, on the other hand, we consider the type of reader that Professor Lessing must have had in mind, we feel that he leaves many things unexplained that would call for elucidation. He

years ago, actually carries his subject as a whole down to, and even beyond, Goethe's death by considering Romanticism, Kleist, Heine, Rückert, Grillparzer and others of that period. Professor Lessing closes his general consideration of authors with the eighteenth century and carries only the discussion of Schiller and Goethe further.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

speaks of the "alliterierende Langzeile" (p. 11), the "Stabreime der Langzeile" (p. 15) and "altgermanische Metrik" (p. 15) as familiar phenomena. He aptly emphasizes the significance of *Meistersang* in bringing plain citizens together in literary clubs for the purpose of transcending the prose of their humdrum existence (p. 74), but no one unfamiliar with the movement could gain even a rough conception of its nature by reading this book. Similarly the *Englische Komödianten* are merely mentioned (p. 110).

Many of Professor Lessing's comparisons and observations are very apt but often hackneyed. He calls attention to the value and interest that *Ruodlieb* would have had for the early Romanticists as supporting their theories (p. 24). He compares Walther von der Vogelweide with Goethe as a lyric poet but finds him more akin to Schiller in the sensuousness of his language, more of an observer than a creator, who lacks the mystic, vulcanic, incalculable elements of Goethe (p. 44). He compares Wolfram's *Parzival* with a Gothic cathedral in its variegated splendor (p. 59). The character and literary influence of Erasmus remind him (as they have reminded others) of Voltaire (pp. 82-83) and Gottsched's position from 1730 to 1740 suggests a comparison with Dr. Johnson in England (p. 126). Klopstock's *Messias* is well but again conventionally described as a sort of oratorio rather than an epic (p. 150).

Gottsched is treated in an altogether moderate and fair manner. His contribution in arousing the spirit of nationalism in Germany (pp. 126-127) and his efforts toward giving the *Schriftsprache* a firmer footing in Catholic South Germany and Austria are rightly stressed. Herder's *Ideen* are described as the classical expression of the theories of Storm and Stress. In the section on Storm and Stress it is refreshing to find a very good, adequate treatment of Klinger (pp. 212-222), who is so often neglected in works of similar scope. It is unusual that Wieland is discussed before Lessing. Similarly in the earlier section Gottfried von Strassburg precedes Wolfram.

Other random points that may deserve notice are the following. The definition of *Leich* (p. 43), although bringing out the force of the Gothic *laiks* (dance), does not do full justice to the influence of the modulations of the liturgic Halleluja (the sequences).

Digitized by Google

Original from
UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

Heinrich von Meissen (Frauenlob), one of the customary links between minnesingers and mastersingers, is not mentioned. The part played by Emperor Maximilian I. personally in writing at least a first draft of *Teuerdank* is not made clear (p. 86). The great philological importance of the editions of Luther's Bible published during the century after Luther's death is not brought out. Murner, certainly one of Luther's bitterest enemies, is not treated in connection with Luther at all, but twenty pages earlier in connection with Brant. Schottel's name does not occur; together with Leibnitz's *Unvorgreifliche Gedanken* (p. 121) the same writer's previous *Ermahnung an die Teutsche, ihren Verstand und Sprache besser zu üben* might well have been referred to. None of the plays of Gryphius is mentioned by name. The point of division of the last two major sections of the book (on the pre-classical and classical periods), the year 1775, while serviceable, is somewhat arbitrary and disruptive.

It is an inconsistency to leave unexplained such a title as Pauli's *Schimpf und Ernst* (p. 111) while elucidating the title of Freidank's *Bescheidenheit* and others. In a number of places (p. 39, beginning at line 12 from bottom; p. 46, beginning at line 12 from bottom; p. 272, beginning at line 6; and p. 293, beginning at line 15) passages from other writers are quoted without giving the source.

There are also incongruities in the spelling of proper nouns and titles. Professor Lessing has followed no fixed practise here and the result is sometimes disturbing. Latin, pseudo-Latin, old Germanic and modern German forms occur indiscriminately. Thus he writes *Wulfila* (pp. 10, 12); *Roswitha* (p. 17); *Hiltgunde* (p. 18); *Eckehard* (p. 18); *Heinrich der Glichesare* (p. 30); *Thomasin von Zirclaria* (p. 46); *Condwiramurs* (p. 54); *Neidhart von Reuental* (p. 45); *der Hürnen Siegfried* (p. 74); Sachs's *Wittenberger Nachtigall* (p. 102) (why not *Wittenbergische?* Sachs wrote *Wittembergisch*); and *Christoph* (i. e., *Christoffel von*) *Grimmelshausen* (p. 117). The author also speaks of Hutten's *Klag und Vermahnung gegen den . . . Gewalt des Bapsts* (p. 100). But Hutten wrote: *Clag und vormanung gegen dem*, etc., so that Professor Lessing's version is neither Hutten's, nor a close approximation of it, nor modern German. We find also *Discourse der Malern* (p. 131) (*Mahlern* in the original, *Maler* in N. H. G.).

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

Misprints are as follows: read *wer des* (or *dessen*) *vergäss* for *wer das vergäss* (p. 44); *Godfrey of Monmouth* for *Godfrey of Monmoth* (p. 48); *Reynke de Vos* for *Reynke des Vos* (p. 75, margin); *Enea Silvio* (the form preferred by the author) for *Enea Sylvio* (p. 84); *Lukian* (the form preferred by the author) for *Lucian* (p. 84, line 3 from bottom, and p. 163); *Euphuismus* for *Euphonismus* (p. 112); *August Hermann Francke* for *August Hermann Franke* (passim); *understanding* for *understanting* (p. 119, line 3 from bottom); *Titel* for *Tittel* (p. 307). Finally Shaftesbury's essay (p. 169) *A Notion* (not *Nation*) *of the historical Draught or Tablature of the Judgment of Hercules* appears not in the *Characteristics.* It is a separate treatise.

EDWIN H. ZEYDEL.

Indiana University.

French Literature during the Last Half-Century. By PIERRE DE BACOURT and J. W. CUNLIFFE. New York: The MacMillan Company, 1923.

Cet ouvrage constitue un guide des plus utiles pour le lecteur américain qui veut trouver un fil conducteur pour se diriger dans l'étude de la production littéraire de la France depuis la guerre de 1870. Il est d'autant plus précieux qu'à ma connaissance il n'existait sur cette période, ni en anglais, ni même en français, d'ouvrage aussi complet et aussi bien informé.

Le manuel de MM. de Bacourt et Cunliffe se compose en réalité de deux parties fort distinctes. Après un chapitre d'introduction qui a pour objet d'indiquer les principaux courants d'idées qui se manifestent pendant la période étudiée, viennent douze chapitres, ou plutôt douze essais, consacrés aux auteurs qu'à tort ou à raison MM. de B. et C. considèrent comme les maîtres du choeur. On trouvera donc les chapitres que l'on attendait sur Zola, Maupassant, Daudet, Loti, Anatole France, Bourget, Barrès, Rostand, Maeterlinck. On sera peut-être un peu surpris de voir mettre au rang de ces protagonistes Brieux, seul des dramaturges contemporains qui avec Rostand ait été jugé digne d'une étude particulière, et encore plus Charles Maurras et Romain Rolland. Dans les derniers chapitres, qui ont pour titre *The symbolist movement; Con-*

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

temporary poetry; Contemporary drama; The new novel, les auteurs ont tracé dans des cadres dont eux-mêmes reconnaissent l'incertitude, le développement de différents genres jusqu'à l'année présente, et s'efforcent de déterminer les courants et les tendances qui se manifestent dans la littérature d'aujourd'hui. A la fin de chaque chapitre, une bibliographie sommaire mais suffisante donne une liste chronologique des ouvrages étudiés, et des indications sur les traductions en anglais des principaux écrivains de cette période.

Avant de passer au détail, une remarque sur la composition de l'ouvrage s'impose. On voit immédiatement le défaut de la méthode adoptée par MM. de B. et C. La forme de l'essai qu'ils ont préférée, pour la première partie de leur travail, les a conduits à négliger des courants d'idées et des genres littéraires que l'on s'attendait à voir au moins notés, en passant, dans une étude de ce genre. C'est ainsi que l'on ne trouvera rien sur les orateurs, les historiens, les philosophes, les écrivains scientifiques, et ce qui est plus surprenant, rien sur la critique. Jules Lemaître est mentionné comme "one of the most sensible and sensitive critics of our time" dans le chapitre sur le *Psychological drama,* où une personne non prévenue ne songerait guère à aller le chercher. On ne trouvera rien non plus sur Brunetière dont le rôle n'a pourtant pas été négligeable. Dans un ouvrage de ce genre il était nécessaire de faire un choix; mais si le livre de MM. de B. et C. est destiné aux étudiants aussi bien qu'au grand public, l'addition d'un chapitre sur la critique semble s'imposer. Dans l'ensemble, les jugements portés sur les auteurs étudiés sont empreints d'une grande modération et d'une remarquable impartialité. A la fin du chapitre sur Zola, on trouvera indiqués en quelques lignes des renseignements utiles sur l'influence que Zola a exercée sur certains écrivains étrangers. Il est curieux qu'on ne trouve point indiqué un seul auteur américain. Les noms de Frank Norris et d'Upton Sinclair, pour n'en citer que deux, auraient pu au moins être donnés.

Dans les chapitres à titres généraux, remplis de faits et de noms, il y aurait à la fois à ajouter et à retrancher. Ne pouvant étudier, même brièvement, tous les écrivains contemporains, MM. de B. et C. ont fait un choix qui par endroit peut être discuté. Etait-il bien utile de donner les noms de MM. Mandelstamm, Maurice Leblanc et Gaston Leroux pour dire que leur œuvre n'appartient pas à la littérature et de passer sous silence des écrivains tels que

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

E. Le Roy, Louis Pergaud, Maurice Maindron et Jules Renard et Estaunié. Je ne me permettrai pas de mettre en doute l'assertion que, dans le roman, les femmes écrivains sont "at any rate the equals of men"; mais on peut au moins se demander s'il était bien utile d'encombrer la bibliographie de la liste complète des ouvrages de Gyp, Jane Marni et bien d'autres dont les chances de survie littéraire sont décidément faibles. On peut regretter qu'un chapitre spécial n'ait pas été consacré au régionalisme, un des mouvements littéraires les plus importants des trente dernières années. Il m'est assez difficile de souscrire au paragraphe consacré à René Boylesve qui semble indiquer que MM. de B. et C. attribuent à la *Leçon d'amour dans un parc,* qui n'est ni le meilleur ni le plus connu des ouvrages de Boylesve, une importance hors de proportion avec la production totale de l'écrivain. Un certain nombre de fautes matérielles dues sans doute au compositeur disparaîtront dans une nouvelle édition. Je signalerai cependant l'orthographe Viau au lieu de Viaud pour le nom patronymique de Pierre Loti qui revient de façon constante dans le chapitre qui lui est consacré. Il est également à souhaiter que dans une nouvelle édition les auteurs donnent un index plus complet.

GILBERT CHINARD.

Johns Hopkins University.

CORRESPONDENCE

AN ARTHURIAN PARALLEL

One of the best known of the stories associated with King Arthur is that which tells how, just before his death, he sent Bedevere to throw Excalibur back into the lake whence it came, and how when Bedevere finally did throw in the sword a hand came up out of the water and caught it. A very curious parallel to this story exists in Welsh folk-lore, but the resemblance has never, so far as I know, been pointed out. The story as told by William Davies[1] in his collection of the folk-lore of Merionethshire is as follows:

"It is said that Hugh Llwyd[2] had two daughters; one of an

[1] "Casgliad o Len-Gwerin Meirion," in *Cofnodion a Chyfansoddiadau Buddugol Eisteddfod Blaenau Ffestiniog, 1898.* (Transactions of the National Eisteddfod of Wales, 1898.) Liverpool, 1900. P. 222.

[2] A Welsh poet (1533?-1620) who acquired among his neighbors the reputation of a magician and about whose name a considerable number of stories gathered.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

inquisitive turn of mind like himself, while the other resembled her mother, and cared not for books. On his death-bed he called his learned daughter to his side, and directed her to take his books on the dark science and throw them into a pool, which he named, from the bridge that spanned the river. The girl went to Llyn Pont Rhyd-ddu with the books, and stood on the bridge, watching the whirlpool beneath, but she could not persuade herself to throw them over, and thus destroy her father's precious treasures. So she determined to tell him a falsehood, and say that she had cast them into the river. On her return home her father asked her whether she had thrown the books into the pool, and on receiving an answer in the affirmative, he, inquiring whether she had seen anything strange when the books reached the river was told that she had seen nothing. 'Then,' said he, 'you have not complied with my request. I cannot die until the books are thrown into the pool.' She took the books a second time to the river, and now, very reluctantly, she hurled them into the pool, and watched their descent. They had not reached the water before two hands appeared, stretched upward out of the pool, and these hands caught the books before they touched the water, and clutching them carefully, both the books and the hands disappeared beneath the water. She went home immediately, and again appeared before her father, and in answer to his question, she related what had occurred. 'Now,' said he, 'I know that you have thrown them in, and I can now die in peace,' which he forthwith did."

Although the resemblance between these two stories is apparent, the exact relationships are by no means clear. Obviously the literary version, being older than the time of Hugh Llwyd, cannot have been taken from this folk-tale, yet it is difficult to believe that if the story had once been known to the people in connection with King Arthur, it would have been disassociated from him and linked up to a much less famous character, especially in a region where stories about Arthur still exist in popular tradition.[3] In all probability both versions of the story represent an earlier tale which in time was attached to the Arthur cycle and so got into literature, but which also continued to exist in its earlier form so that it could be attributed to Hugh Llwyd as well as to Arthur. This process would be very similar to what seems to have taken place in the old story of the warriors sleeping in a cave waiting until it should be time for them to awake and save their native

[3] According to local tradition Arthur was born in the parish of Llanuwchllyn, and now sleeps in a cavern near Bala; Llyn Llydaw into which his sword Excalibur was thrown is not far away, and the tomb of the giant Rhitta, slain by Arthur, is on the top of the near-by Snowdon. There are still other references to Arthur and his men in the neighborhood. Davies, *op. cit.*, 84 ff., and John Rhys, *Celtic Folklore Welsh and Manx*, Oxford, 1901. II, 476, 478.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

land. Sometimes their leader is Arthur, sometimes he is Owen Lawgoch; Professor Rhys[4] believes that he has found evidence that both have taken the place of an earlier divinity about whom the story was originally told.

JOHN J. PARRY.

University of Illinois.

SOME NOTES TO A NOTE

In *Modern Language Notes,* XXXVIII, 140 ff., Professor Herbert D. Austin develops the interesting theory that Dante, preoccupied with the stupendous transition from the material universe to the spiritual, which he was preparing to describe in Canto XXX, shows throughout the *Paradiso* what Professor Austin variously terms a "quirk," an "inversion bias," or "a whimsical predilection for the concept of reversed direction."

It is, of course, conceivable that Dante was suffering from some sort of an inside-out complex, but Professor Austin's evidence is hardly conclusive, and the skeptic will remain with some justice unconvinced.

In the first place, it was not necessarily a "quirk of Dante's imagination" that was "responsible for those two odd conceits" in *Paradiso,* II, 23-24, and XXII, 109-110. Was it not rather his normal use of a standard trope in medieval rhetoric, familiar to him both from his formal studies in the *Trivium* and from his eager private conning of Virgil? Unquestionably, he knew Servius's commentary on his *Maestro,* and even if he would by himself have passed over Vergilian phrases such as "moriamur et in media arma ruamus" (*Aeneid,* II, 353) without notice, Servius forcibly drew his attention to the fact that this, like other phrases, did not result from any "inversion bias" in the mind of Vergil, but was simply an example of the well-known rhetorical figure *hysteron proteron.* And a medieval student would have so glossed Dante's "Tu non avresti in tanto tratto e messo Nel foco il dito . . ." ; recognizing *hysteron proteron,* both here and in the cross-bow passage, as readily and as naturally as his twentieth-century ectype spots an accusative with the infinitive construction.

Later Professor Austin stresses the fact that in Dante's upward journey he has a vision of each of the three Persons of the Trinity, "and these are presented in *the reverse of the canonical order!*" But can this be seriously regarded as a case of inversion? One hardly needs to point out that only if the vision of God the Father had been revealed to the ascending Dante in the lower heaven,

[4] *Op. cit.,* II, 493.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

the Son in the higher, and the Holy Spirit in the highest could there really be a question of reversal.

Again, " Quell' *uno e due e tre* che sempre vive/e regna sempre in *tre e 'n due e 'n uno, . . .* " is called " a formula that reverses the Trinity most effectively and simply." Yet, if the phrase does imply any such reversal (and the nature or even the possibility of a reversed Trinity is not quite clear), it was St. Athanasius, or rather the unknown author of the *Quicunque vult,* and not Dante who was primarily responsible for the somewhat unorthodox operation. Dante was really doing little more than translating and expanding a familiar phrase from the well-known *Symbolum Sancti Athanasii,*[1] which might be found in any medieval breviary: " Ita ut per omnia . . . . *et Unitas in Trinitate et Trinitas in Unitate* veneranda sit."

And again, it is difficult to accept the " suggestion of reversal " which Professor Austin finds in Dante's interesting description of the sound-waves passing from Beatrice in the center of the spirit circle to St. Thomas on the circumference, and those passing from St. Thomas on the circumference to Beatrice in the center. The theory of sound-waves and the comparison to ripples on the surface of water Dante found, as is well known, in Boethius's description " Quis modus sit audiendi ";[2] and there is surely no " inversion " or " reversal " in this particular application of them, except in so far as some such idea is implicit in every question or observation and reply. It is almost as if Professor Austin had added up the sum of Dante's usages of the prefix *ri* (note the striking number of *risposte* throughout the *Commedia*!) as evidence of his " whimsical predilection for the concept of reversed direction."

Much of Professor Austin's evidence for Dante's inversion bias, then, seems open to serious question. And, in conclusion, we cannot help regretting that (on p. 142) the aristocratic name and title of that gallant old hero, the Baron Munchausen, are suppressed by a passing reference to him as " the hunter," and his famous wolf is metamorphosed to a bear. *Sic transit gloria mundi!* or, as Dante puts it, " O vanagloria dell'umane posse! "

WALTER L. BULLOCK.

Bryn Mawr College.

---

[1] The *Athanasian Creed* of the modern Anglican Prayer-book.
[2] *De Institutione Musica,* I, 14.

Digitized by Google

Original from
UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

A Correction

In the *M. L. N.* for February my treatise, *Hebbel, Ibsen and the Analytic Exposition,* is accorded a "Brief Mention," in the course of which the reviewer makes certain statements I should like to comment on. He says I assume that literary criticism "generally accepts Ibsen as the introducer of this method of analytic exposition," whereas in reality I say that the analytic exposition is "generally supposed to have been introduced into *modern drama* by Ibsen"—a vital distinction. (I was also fully aware of the few exceptions to this assertion: Fr. Th. Vischer, some special students of Hebbel and Schiller, and Henderson among the Americans). After this the reviewer proceeds with his argument on the further incorrect idea that my book, too, ignores, or practically ignores, the analytic exposition in Greek drama, and thus he (wrongly) attributes to me the same fallacy which he (wrongly) assumes I attribute to literary criticism. On this basis he quotes Gottschall and Steiger to set me right. But as I neither assume that Ibsen introduced the method *into drama,* nor that literary criticism assumes this, all this argument of the reviewer is to no purpose. He must have been misled by his overlooking the words, *into modern drama,* in the one instance, and in the other instance by a statement of mine that there are traces of the analytic exposition in *German drama before Hebbel.* He reasons as if I had said there were only traces of it in *Greek drama.*

In his next paragraph the reviewer remarks: "In discussing the work of the two dramatists from the angle of exposition, Professor Campbell's little book, then, restates certain facts already known, but succeeds notably in presenting a clear outline of the expository form as illustrated in the dramatic practice of the various centuries." If by "expository form" the reviewer means the method of exposition, he is giving me credit for notable success in something I do not attempt. As to the "facts already known" that I am said to restate, he nowhere specifies them. He could hardly mean the fact that the analytic exposition was employed in ancient as well as in modern drama, for he argues above as if I had not taken that sufficiently into account.

While in his concluding sentences the reviewer touches upon the real theme of my treatise, he might have pointed out more clearly its main constructive propositions, which are: That the analytic exposition in modern drama finds its explanation in the problem the dramatist faced of showing the influence of environment in the shaping of character, within the time limits imposed by the stage; and that Hebbel, because of the importance he attached to the *Werden* of his characters, naturally hit upon this solution.

T. M. Campbell.

Wesleyan University.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

ON THE ORIGIN OF THE SHELLEY SOCIETY (POSTSCRIPT)

By the first and fifth paragraphs of Professor Newman I. White's reply[1] to my criticism of his article on *Shelley's Debt to Alma Murray,* in which reply he frankly admits the validity of certain of my objections, I believe my inquiry[2] has been justified, at least as far as the accuracy of those statements is concerned. But as he and I remain at variance on the subject of the comparative importance of the *Hellas* performance (to which Professor White made only a passing reference in his first article); the size of the *Cenci* audience; the purpose or purposes for which the Shelley Society was formed, its fruits, and its lease of life, I feel obliged to reënter the lists in behalf of a more accurate understanding of these matters.

"The *Cenci* performance," writes Professor White, "likewise was ambitious in that it was an effort to settle a disputed point, namely, the acting qualities of the play, whereas the *Hellas* performance was apparently of interest principally from a musical point of view, which had no such close relationship to Shelley's reputation as poet or dramatist." It is interesting to note that the originator of the Society held quite a different view. In a postscript accompanying a four-page leaflet on the forthcoming *Cenci* performance, issued by the Shelley Society in April, 1886, Dr. Furnivall presented this request to the membership of the society:

> ·Not by authority of the Committee, but of myself, I ask my fellow-members for help to produce Shelley's *Hellas*, with Dr. Selle's music and choruses, and recitations by good actors, in November next. I am sure that every member of the Society would like to see and hear the *Hellas* soon, and to signalize the Society's first year's work by the performance of both Shelley's great Tragedies, as well as the issue of a dozen publications.[3]

In this statement we may observe that Dr. Furnivall pledged the interest of the entire society in the production of *both* of Shelley's "great tragedies" in the same year; and suggested that the *Hellas* should be presented not only for the sake of Dr. Selle's music and choruses, but with "recitations by good actors." It is clear that Dr. Furnivall did not make the mistake (which one

[1] *M. L. N.* XXXIX, pp. 18-22.
[2] *M. L. N.*, XXXVIII, pp. 159-64.
[3] *Shelley Society. Performance of The Cenci*, &c. (pamphlet), 1886, p. 3. The Secretary's letter to the membership, opening the pamphlet, substantiates, by the way, Mrs. Alfred Forman's statement (recorded by Professor White in a footnote to his original article) that May 7th "was chosen as a compliment to Robert Browning" whose birthday it was.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

unfamiliar with the Greek tragedies, Shelley's models, might) of thinking that *Hellas,* actually written as "a sort of imitation of the *Persae* of Aeschylus,"[4] was conceived as an opera rather than as a drama in the Greek manner, and that therefore interest in its production, in London, would center about the incidental music furnished by Dr. Selle, "an old-fashioned musician of the Sterndale Bennett school."[5]

As a matter of history, too, I must insist that the attendance (which I cannot agree with Professor White in considering "a trivial criterion" of the importance of this production) at the *Cenci* performance in all probability did not exceed 2300, since the Grand Theater at Islington seated only 1957 persons.[6] This fact was my reason for selecting "the lowest figures cited for the *Cenci* performance."

If as he pleads, "it makes no difference" whether Genevieve Ward or her friends "attempted to organize a private production" of *The Cenci* a few years before the Shelley Society's performance of the play, I suppose that his original statement that Miss Ward had herself "attempted to organize a private production" need hardly be called in question. Exercising the same latitude, Professor White may also be allowed to refer to the production of *The Cenci* as "the avowed primary purpose" of the organization, and chief reason for the cohesion of the Society during 1886, although as I have shown, other avowed purposes were given equal emphasis in the early announcements of the Society—purposes realized later by the efforts of the whole group.

Looseness in one statement easily leads to looseness in many; and we are not therefore surprised to discover that in his latest article Professor White refers to the late Edward Dowden as the "author" of Shelley's review of Thomas Jefferson Hogg's *Memoirs of Prince Alexy Haimatoff,* which originally appeared in the *Critical Review* for December, 1814, and was reprinted by the Shelley Society in 1886 under the editorship of Mr. Thomas J. Wise.

"It appears," asserts Professor White, in the same article, "that the last paper delivered in the Society and subsequently published was delivered in 1888." Unfortunately again, extant evidence destroys the theory. On June 26, 1889, the Reverend Stopford Brooke addressed the Society on the subject: "Some Remarks Upon the Lyric Poetry of Shelley"[7] which were published in his *Studies in Poetry* (2nd imp., 1908.[8] On November 12, 1890,

[4] Shelley to John Gisborne, Oct. 22, 1821. *Letters of Shelley,* ed. Ingpen, 1914, p. 920.
[5] *Notebook of the Shelley Society,* 1888, p. 81.
[6] *Shelley Society. Performance of the Cenci,* p. 2.
[7] Shelley Society *Notice* (1 p., n. d.) signed by Mr. Wise as Secretary.
[8] Pp. 144-175.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

Mr. W. E. A. Axon read a paper on "Shelley's Vegetarianism" before the Society,[9] and this was subsequently published in pamphlet form,[10] without date. On December 10, 1890, Mr. W. M. Rossetti presented before the membership an essay on "The Shelleys Near Geneva; Dr. Polidori's Diary" [11] which was printed, with alterations, as an Introduction to his edition of Dr. Polidori's Diary,[12] in 1911.

WALTER EDWIN PECK.

College of Wooster.

BRIEF MENTION

Curiously enough the oldest collections of edifying and entertaining stories were those in Latin made in the later Middle Ages for the use of preachers. For convenience of reference these collections were arranged alphabetically according to topics, and soon led to imitations in the modern languages, such as *An Alphabet of Tales* (E. E. T. Soc., 1904-5), the Catalan *Recull de Eximplis,* Barcelona, 1881-84, the Spanish *Libro de los Exemplos* edited by Gayongos and Morel-Fatio, etc. The original Latin collections were made primarily for edification and it was not until the close of the Middle Ages that collections in Latin and the modern languages were made for the purpose of general entertainment, although the element of edification was by no means lacking. The most extensive and famous of these modern collections are Johannes Pauli's *Schimpf und Ernst,* 1522 and Kirchhof's *Wendunmut,* 1563, both accessible in Oesterley's editions in the publications of the Literarischer Verein of Stuttgart. The edition of Pauli was published in 1866, and, like that of Kirchhof, 1869, is invaluable for the mass of references to sources and imitations gathered by the learned editor. Since the date of Oesterley's edition a large and important literature has grown up in regard to mediæval tales and their diffusion, and many collections of texts have been published. It was a happy thought of the Berlin publisher Herbert Stubenrauch to undertake a new edition of Pauli and to entrust its preparation to the scholar best fitted

[9] Calendar of the Shelley Society's Session, 1890-1, pub. in *Sh. Soc. Papers,* Pt. II.

[10] *Shelley's Vegetarianism,* by William E. A. Axon, F. R. S. L., etc., pp. 13.

[11] *Op. cit.* in note 9, above.

[12] *The Diary of Dr. John William Polidori, 1816. Relating to Byron, Shelley,* etc., Edited and Elucidated by William Michael Rossetti, London, 1911.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

for the work, Dr. Johannes Bolte. The new edition, the first part of which is before us, forms the first volume of: *Alte Erzähler neu herausgegeben von* Johannes Bolte, Erster Band, Johannes Pauli, *Schimpf und Ernst,* Erster Teil, Berlin, Herbert Stubenrauch Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1924. The title page of the first part adds: *Die älteste Ausgabe von 1522.* The work is beautifully printed on excellent paper, in quarto form, pp. 36, 418. The second part will contain indexes, a history of the work and its diffusion, the nine *märlein* or stories contained in Pauli's sermons, and the sources and parallels completing, and enlarging Oesterley's edition. The first part contains the text of the oldest edition with an important introduction on Pauli's life and writings. As the reviewer hopes to notice at greater length the completed work, he will remark here briefly that the dates of Pauli's birth and death are lacking, but he was born probably between 1450-1454, and was not living in 1533. His life was spent largely in Alsace where he was a member of the Franciscan order and active as a reader (Lector), preacher and confessor in various cloisters of his order. He collected and published the sermons of Geiler von Keisersberg as well as some other works of this famous preacher. Pauli's fame, however, rests upon his *Schimpf und Ernst,* a collection of six hundred and ninety-three stories, of which about a third are serious, the rest jocose (*Schimpf* = *Scherz*). In the course of time the serious character of the work receded more and more into the background. The idea came to Pauli, as Bolte thinks, while he was editing Geiler's sermons (over a hundred passages from which are found in *Schimpf und Ernst*) or making from Geiler's stories and the Latin *exempla*-literature of the Middle Ages a work at once edifying and entertaining which should find its readers less among the monastic officials than among the inmates of the cloisters and the laity. The arrangement is in groups divided according to the various classes of society (priests, monks, judges, landlords, maidens, fools, etc.) and moral ideas (truth, lies, avarice, idleness, adultery, alms, honoring father and mother, etc.). These divisions are, however, purposely jumbled together. Bolte enumerates briefly in his introduction Pauli's sources. Among these are the well-known mediæval treatises for the use of preachers, such as Bromyard's *Summa predicantium* (from which over a hundred stories are taken), the *Scala Celi* of Johannes Gobii Junior, etc.; classic authors such as could be found in Valerius Maximus, Aesop's fables and Cato's distichs, and oral tradition and personal experience. Pauli has used his material freely as can be seen by a comparison of his stories with their originals in Bromyard, for instance. In this huge work the enormous number of stories are given in the driest and most concise form. Pauli expands these sketches and gives them literary life.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

Again scholars owe a debt of gratitude to Dr. Bolte and the publishers who in these difficult times can find readers for such substantial works. T. F. C.

Les techniques de la critique et de l'histoire littéraires en littérature française moderne. By Gustave Rudler. Oxford: Clarendon Press and New York: Oxford University Press, 1923. xv + 204 pp. M. Rudler's first task should have been to explain why he thought there was still need for his book after the appearance of Morize's *Problems and Methods of Literary History,* but no such explanation is given. He merely lists the latter work with others at the end of his preface. Indeed he implies that he completed his preface before he knew that Morize had written, for he dates it Dec. 20, 1922 and *Problems and Methods* 1923, although the latter appeared in December, 1922 and, as Morize tells me, a copy of it was received by R. while he was preparing his own book, which appeared only in December, 1923. The error in the date assigned to Morize's work is, of course, unintentional, but it is most unfortunate that such an essential date should be given incorrectly at the beginning of a treatise intended to teach "the best technical methods." Moreover the preface ought to be almost the last thing a scholar writes. A paragraph could surely have been inserted during the course of the year 1923, stating to what extent R. believed he was adding to the work of his predecessor.

As both authors are French literary historians of distinction, belonging to the same school and teaching in leading Anglo-Saxon universities, the similarity that exists between their doctrines, their methods, even their illustrations may often be explained as due to a common experience, but at times the resemblance is so close that, unless he is warned by the author, the reader may believe it due to direct borrowing. For instance, in the chapters on attribution each writer selects his three leading examples from articles concerned with Diderot's *Paradoxe,* Pascal's *Discours sur les passions de l'âme,* and La Boétie's *Contr'un* and gives them, in both cases, in this order, which is the reverse of the chronological. R. makes no mention of M. in this chapter, an omission that is hardly atoned for by the inclusion of M.'s name among those of whom it is said that "d'excellents, de remarquables travaux ont été menés à bien par de très jeunes gens" (p. 201).

M.'s book is more complete in its information about bibliography, biography, versification, and chronology. There is little to choose between the chapters in the two books on sources, attribution, and influence. R. adds considerably to M. in what he has to say about collation (pp. 60-80), in his chapter on *critique générale* and in most of that devoted to *critique de genèse* (pp. 140-155); also in

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

his two concluding chapters on *critique sociologique* and *critique psychologique collective,* which will, however, be of more interest to the mature scholar than to the beginner in literary history.

M. has a much broader point of view with regard to other fields than modern French literature, other literary historians than French. A student is apt to think, if he reads only R., that the study of modern French literature in the last thirty years owes nothing to work done in Old French, in the classics, and in other modern literatures, also that almost all students of French literary history are Frenchmen, surely a discouraging suggestion for R.'s students at Oxford. Work done by Italians and Germans is almost entirely ignored. Even such important bibliographical journals as *ZRPh.* and *JRP.* are left unmentioned, except for a general reference to Lanson's *Manuel.* Native Americans fare a little better, for Thieme, Gayly, and Kurtz are referred to, a college text by Oliver, and an article in *RHL.* by Blossom. Few Englishmen are named, but, doubtless to compensate for this neglect, frequent reference is made to at least one resident of England, to M. Rudler himself. He mentions ten of his published books and articles and several others that are yet to appear. Some of these references are doubtless justified, but R.'s article on *Andromaque* (mentioned on pp. 122, 131, 157) is no proper example of "critique de genèse." I should hesitate even to refer to it in the chapter on sources, for, where there are so many articles that might be cited, why select one which, while containing an interesting suggestion, "n'a rien de définitif"?

It is amusing to find in a book that contains no index the following word of counsel (p. 13):

> Il est désirable que tout livre soit suivi d'un index des personnes citées et des matières; sans quoi, tout ce qui n'est pas l'objet propre et direct de l'ouvrage se trouve perdu."

It is inadvisable to discuss Bovet's book (pp. 35, 36), unless one warns students against a theory that pays so little attention to fact as to consider the epic the predestined *genre* for French literature between 1610 and 1715. Rigal's article on *Ruy Blas* was excellent at the time it was written, but, as he gave the *Lady of Lyons* rather than the life of Angelica Kauffmann as one of its chief sources and as he knew nothing of Victor Hugo's own statement as to how the idea of the play came to him, it is not to be selected as a model of "critique de genèse."

Despite these defects, however, there is much that is excellent in the book. It gives the graduate student sound advice as to the aims and methods of literary history, and this advice is clearly presented, with interesting illustrative examples. As I have pointed out, several chapters may be read with profit even by a student who is well acquainted with Morize's book. Both works should be in the libraries of all universities giving graduate work in modern French literature. H. C. L.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

The Troubadours and England. By H. J. Chaytor. (Cambridge University Press, 1923. 164 pp.) We are quite accustomed, of course, to finding the sources of mediæval English poems in Anglo-Norman or northern French originals. For nearly three hundred years after the Conquest, French was the language not only of the king of England and the nobility, of the law courts and the pulpit, of commerce and the guilds, but, naturally enough, of polite literature and, to a great extent, of minstrelsy. So close indeed were the literary connections between England and France in the early Middle Ages that it is sometimes difficult to decide whether a given work was first written down on the island or on the continent.

Mr. Chaytor, however, is interested not so much in establishing the well-documented interrelations between England and northern France, as in trying to find out—a far more difficult task—to what extent the English lyric was influenced by that distinctive product of southern France, the courtly songs of Provence. He admits frankly that such traces of Provençal influence as he discovers may have reached England indirectly through northern poets rather than directly from southern France, but he shows that there was at least sufficient commercial and political intercourse between England and Provence in the Middle Ages to have made the more direct route a possibility.

He proceeds to point out that one or two of the troubadours actually visited England and that others came into contact with the English court on the continent. Some twenty-eight troubadours mention English affairs in their poems. Turning from external to internal evidence, the author examines both English and Anglo-Norman lyrics, and finds in them stanzaic structure, rhyme schemes, *genres,* and certain forms of thought that are peculiarly characteristic of the songs of the troubadours. He realizes, of course, that the relative poverty of rhymes in English makes exact parallels for the more complicated Provençal rhyme schemes difficult to discover, and that "the spirit of the Middle English lyric is not that of the troubadours," but he concludes from the varied evidence he has assembled that English lyric poetry owes a considerable debt to the poets of Provence.

This conclusion may not have equal weight with all critics. The subject has by no means been exhausted in this slender volume, and, as the author suggests, a comparison of the melodies in the Provençal and English manuscripts may well throw further light upon it. The detailed and impartial presentation of the material, however—and Mr. Chaytor does not stretch his hypotheses—is in itself a distinct contribution. G. F.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

RECENT PUBLICATIONS

ENGLISH

Abercrombie, Lascelles. — The Theory of Poetry. *London:* Martin Secker, 1924.

Biggane, Cecil. — John Masefield. *Cambridge, Eng.:* Heffer, 1924.

Briscoe, Walter A.—Byron, The Poet. A Collection of Addresses and Essays. *London:* Routledge, 1924. 12s. 6d.

Busby, Olive M.—Studies in the Development of the Fool in the Elizabethan Drama. *Oxford:* University Press, 1923.

Clutton-Brock, A., Dearmer, Percy, Duncan-Jones, A. S., Murry, J. Middleton, Pollard, A. W., and Spencer, Malcolm.—The Necessity of Art. *London:* S. C. M., 1924.

Dobson, Austin.—The Poetical Works of Austin Dobson. *New York:* Oxford University Press, 1924. $1.50.

Donnelly, F. P.—Art Principles in Literature. *New York:* The Macmillan Co., 1924.

Goode, Clement T. — Byron as Critic. *Macon, Georgia:* Mercer University, 1924. 312 pp.

Holzknecht, Karl J.—Literary Patronage in the Middle Ages. Dissertation. *Philadelphia:* University of Pennsylvania, 1923.

Hoyt, Arthur S.—The Spiritual Message of Modern English Poetry. *New York:* The Macmillan Company, 1924. $2.00.

Lee, Sir Sidney, and Boas, F. S. — The Year's Work in English Studies, 1922. *Oxford and New York:* Oxford University Press, 1924.

Lamborn, G. B., and Harrison, E. A. G.—Shakespeare, the Man and his Stage. *Oxford:* University Press, 1923. $1.00.

Nicoll, Allardyce. — An Introduction to Dramatic Theory. *London:* George G. Harrap & Co., 1923.

Pritchard, F. H. — Training in Literary Appreciation. *New York:* The T. Y. Crowell Company, 1924. $2.00.

Roe, F. C.—Taine et L'Angleterre. *Paris:* E. Champion, 1923.

Weirick, Bruce.—From Whitman to Sandburg in American Poetry. A Critical Survey. *New York:* The Macmillan Company, 1924.

Wells, Henry W.—Poetic Imagery. *New York:* Columbia University Press, 1924. $1.75.

GERMAN

Baldinger, Ernst.—Der Minnesänger Graf Rudolf von Fenis-Neuenburg. Eine literarhist. Untersuchung. *Bern:* A. Francke, 1923. xi, 91 pp. Fr. 7.

Berendson, Walter A.—Der Stil Carl Spittelers. Zur Frage d. Versepos in neuerer Zeit. *Zürich:* Verlag Seldwyla, 1923. 49 pp. M. 1.20.

Birven, Henri.—Goethes Faust und der Geist der Magie. *Leipzig:* Talis-Verlag, 1923. viii + 168 pp. M. 3.

Blümel, Rudolf.—Die deutsche Schallform der letzten Blütezeit und ihrer Ausläufer in Dichtung und Prosa. *Halle:* Max Niemeyer, 1923. 105 pp. M. 0.70.

Bormann, Karl.—Die Metrik im "Guten Gerhard" des Rudolf von Ems. *Halle:* Niemeyer, 1923. ix + 71 pp. M. 2.

Bornstein, Paul.—Friedrich Hebbels Persönlichkeit. Gespräche, Urteile, Erinnerungen, ges. u. erl. 2 Bde. *Berlin:* Propyläen-Verlag, 1924. xxxvi, 630; vii, 570 pp. M. 18.

[Bräuning-Oktavio, H.] Der Erstdruck von Goethes Götz von Berlichingen. (Eine Erinnerungsschrift 1773-1923. Mit Nachbildungen von gleichzeitigen Druckwerken aus der L. C. Wittich'schen Hofbuchdrukkerei, Darmstadt). *Darmstadt:* L. C. Wittich, 1923. 46 pp., plates. 4°.

Buisonjé, J. C. de.—Charlotte von Stein und Christiane Vulpius, spätere von Goethe, in Goethes Lyrik [Utrecht diss.]. *Bussum, Holland:* van Dishoeck, 1923. xx + 216 + 3 pp.

Feist, Sigmund.—Etymologisches Wörterbuch der gotischen Sprache mit Einschluss des Krimgotischen u. sonstiger Sprachreste. 2. neubearb. Aufl. *Halle:* Niemeyer, 1923. xv + 448 pp. M. 15.

Gewerstock, Olga.—Lucian und Hutten. Zur Geschichte des Dialogs im 16. Jahrh. [Germ. Studien, H. 31]. *Berlin:* Ebering, 1924. 178 pp. M. 5.20.

Goethe, Ottilie v.—Erlebnisse u. Geständnisse. Hrsg. v. H. H. Houben. *Leipzig:* Klinkhardt & Biermann, 1923. xix + 232 pp. Bound, M. 7.50.

Goethes biographisches Schema in getreuer Nachbildung seiner Hs. hrsg. v. G. Witkowski. *Leipzig:* Mayer & Müller, 1922. 32 pp., 152 pp. facsimile. Bound, M. 40.

Gossel, Josef.—Buch der Wortspiele. Hrsg. von —. 1.-4. Aufl. *Köln a. Rh.:* Hoursch & Bechstedt, 1923. 95 pp.

Greferath, Theodor. — Studien zu den Mundarten zwischen Köln, Jülich, M.-Gladbach u. Neuss. [Deu. Dialektgeographie, H. 11 b.] *Marburg:* Elwert, 1922. vi + 128 pp.

Grillparzer-Studien. Hrsg. von O. Katann. *Wien:* Gerlach & Wiedling, 1924. 332 pp., 25 plates.

Grillparzers Selbstbiographie und Bildnisse. Hrsg. v. Ludwig Böck u. Wilh. Engelmann. *Wien:* 1923. xv + 350 pp.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

Haller, Albrecht v.—Briefe an Johannes Gessner (1728-1777). Hrsg., eingel., u. m. Anm. versehen von H. E. Sigerist. [Abh. d. kgl. Ges. d. Wiss. zu Göttingen, Math.-phys. Kl. N. F. Bd. 11, 2]. *Berlin:* Weidmann, 1923. ii, viii, 576 pp. 4°.

Haupt, Julius.—Elementargeister bei Fouqué, Immermann und Hoffmann. *Leipzig:* Wolkenwanderer-Verlag, 1923. vii + 123 pp. Cloth, M. 6.

Herder.—Kleinere Aufsätze. I. [Cambridge Plain Texts.] *Cambridge:* University Press, 1923. vii + 59 pp.

Hieber, Hermann.—Eduard Mörikes Gedankenwelt. *Stuttgart:* Strecker & Schröder, 1923. vii + 218 pp. M. 2.

Kaufmann, Henning.—Die Dichtung der Rheinlande. Eine landschaftliche und örtliche Bibliographie nebst einem Abriss ihrer Entwicklung. *Bonn:* Schroeder, 1923. 128 pp. M. 3.

Kluge, Friedr.—Etymologisches Wörterbuch der deutschen Sprache. 10., verb. u. verm. Aufl. *Berlin:* de Gruyter & Co., 1924. xvi, 558 pp. Bound, M. 15.

Kossmann, E. F.—Die siebenzeilige Strophe in der deutschen Literatur. *The Hague:* Martinus Nijhoff, 1923. viii + 102 pp. Fl. 3.

Lessings, G. E., sämtliche Schriften. Hrsg. v. K. Lachmann. Dritte . . . Aufl. besorgt durch Franz Muncker. 23. Band. *Berlin u. Leipzig:* de Gruyter & Co., 1924. xv + 265 pp.

Löwis of Menar, August.—Die Brünhildsage in Russland. [Palaestra, 142.] *Leipzig:* Mayer & Müller, 1923. 110 pp. M. 2.

Michel, Wilh.—Hölderlins abendländische Wendung. *Jena:* E. Diederichs, 1923. 109 pp. M. 4.

Mitzka, Walter.—Studien zum baltischen Deutsch. [Deutsche Dialektgeographie, H. 17]. *Marburg:* Elwert, 1923. viii + 128 pp. M. 3.50.

Möller, Alfred.—Ferdinand Raimund. Bilder von seinem Lebensweg. *Graz:* Moser, 1923. vii + 119 pp. Kr. 18000.

Müller, Jos.—Jean Paul u. seine Bedeutung für die Gegenwart. 2., umgearb. Aufl. *Leipzig:* F. Meiner, 1923. viii + 396 pp. M. 7.

Neidhart (von Reuenthal).—Lieder. Hrsg. von M. Haupt. 2. Aufl. Neu bearb. v. E. Wiessner. *Leipzig:* Hirzel, 1923. lxxix + 365 pp. M. 8.

Noreen, Erik.—Studier rörande Eufemiavisorna. 1. Textkritiska anmärkningar till Flores och Blanzaflor. [Skrifter utg. af K. Humanistiska Vetenskaps-Samfundet i Uppsala. 22, 2]. *Uppsala:* Almquist & Wiksell, 1923. 34 pp. Kr. 2.

Pinloche, A.—Etymologisches Wörterbuch der deutschen Sprache, enth.: ein Bilder-Wörterbuch mit erkl. Legenden zu 5700 Abb. einem Verz. d. Eigennamen u. einer gramm. Übersicht. Unter Mitwirkung von Theodor Matthias. *Paris:* Larousse; *Leipzig:* Brandstetter, 1922. xiii + 1204 pp. Bound, M. 36.

Rapp, Eleonore.—Die Marionette in der deutschen Dichtung vom Sturm u. Drang bis zur Romantik. *Leipzig:* Lehmann & Schüppel, 1924. 53 pp. M. 2.

Russo, Wilhelm.—Goethes Faust auf den Berliner Bühnen. [Germ. Studien, H. 32]. *Berlin:* Ebering, 1924. iii, 224 pp. M. 5.65.

Schlegel, A. W. v. — Vorlesungen über dramatische Kunst und Literatur. Krit. Ausg. Eingel. u. m. Anm. versehen von Giovanni Vittorio Amoretti. 2 Bde. *Bonn:* Schroeder, 1923. cxiv, 219; v, 339 pp. Cloth, M. 16.

Streitberg, W.—Stand und Aufgaben der Sprachwissenschaft. Festschrift für Wilhelm Streitberg. Von J. Friedrich, J. B. Hofmann, W. Horn, I. Jordan, G. Ipsen, H. Junker, F. Karg, C. Karstien, K. H. Meyer, V. Michels, W. Porzig, H. Reichelt, E. Sievers, F. Sommer, F. Specht, A. Walde, A. Walter, J. Weisweiler, H. Zeller. *Heidelberg:* Carl Winter, 1924. xix + 683 pp. Large 8vo. M. 22.

Storm, Theodor. — Die Regentrude und andere Erzählungen. Hrsg. v. Elisabeth Joachim. *New York:* Oxford Univ. Press, 1923. 95 pp. 70 cts.

Vos, B. J. — Treasury of German Song. A Collection of Lyrics and Ballads. *New York:* Henry Holt & Co. [1924]. vii + 81 pp.

FRENCH

Balzac. — Ursule Mirouët, ed by T. H. Bertenshaw. *New York:* Longmans, Green, 1923. 72 pp. 30 cts.

Belton, L. — V. Hugo et son frère à la pension Cordier. *Blois:* Duguet, 1923. 20 pp.

Brun, A.—L'Introduction du fr. dans les provinces du midi. Diss. *Paris:* Champion, 1923. xv + 505 pp. Fr. 27.

—— L'Introd. de la langue fr. en Béarn et en Roussillon. Diss. *Paris:* Champion, 1923. 94 pp. Fr. 6.

Butler, K. T.—A History of French Literature. *New York:* Dutton (1923). 2 vols. xiii + 496, viii + 395 pp. $9.

Centenaire de Renan. *Mâcon:* Protat. 1923. 56 pp.

Cherbuliez—Le Comte Kostia. ed. by T. H. Bertenshaw. *New York:* Longmans, Green, 1923. 64 pp. 30 cts.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

Ducros, L.—La Société fr. au XVIIIe s. *Paris:* Hatier, 1922. viii + 392 pp.

Eker, S. J.—Syntaxe du participe passé en ancien fr. Diss. *Toulouse:* Impr. du Centre, 1923. 107 pp.

Erckmann-Chatrian.—La Montre du doyen. Le vieux tailleur. Ed. by T. H. Bertenshaw. *New York:* Longmans, Green, 1923. 56 pp. 25 cts.

—— La comète, ed. by T. H. Bertenshaw. *Ibid.* 32 pp. 15 cts.

Estève, E. — Etudes de littérature préromantique. *Paris:* Champion, 1923. vi + 225 pp. Fr. 15.

Gilliéron, J.—Thaumaturgie linguistique. *Paris:* Champion, 1923. 159 pp.

Hérédia, J. M. de. — Poésies complètes. *Paris:* Lemerre, 1924. 355 pp.

Hunkins, C. H. — Favorite Fr. Poems. *New York:* Holt, 1924. xiv + 139 pp.

Kerdaniel, E. L. de—André de la Vigne. *Paris:* Champion, 1923. 125 pp. Fr. 6.50.

Larat, J. — La tradition et l'exotisme dans l'œuvre de Ch. Nodier. *Paris:* Champion, 1923. vi + 450 pp.

—— Bibliographie critique des œuvres de Ch. Nodier. *Paris:* Champion, 1923. 145 pp.

Magne, E.—Scarron et son milieu. Nouv. éd., aug. de documents inédits. *Paris:* Emile-Paul. 1924. 346 pp. Fr. 7.50.

Massis, H. — Jugements. Gide, Rolland. Duhamel, etc. *Paris:* Plon-Nourrit, 1924. 295 pp. Fr. 7.50.

Maurras, Ch. — Trois idées politiques. Châteaubriand. Michelet. Sainte-Beuve. *Paris:* Crès, 1923. viii + 98 pp.

Mousset, A. — Un témoin ignoré de la Révolution, le comte de Fernan Nuñez. *Paris:* Champion, 1923. ix + 356 pp. Fr. 25.

Nourry, E.—Les Contes de Ch. Perrault et les récits parallèles. *Paris:* Nourry, 1924. 675 pp. Fr. 30.

Pascal.—Les Lettres. *Paris:* Crès, 1922. x + 349 pp. Fr. 7.

Rabbe, A.—Album d'un pessimiste, ed. by J. Marsan. *Paris:* Presses fr. (1924). xlvii + 214 pp. (Bibl. romantique).

Reinhard, J. R.—Le Roman d'Eledus et Serene. *Austin:* U. of Texas Publications, 1924. xvi + 257 pp. $4.25.

Refort, L. — L'Art de Michelet. Diss. *Paris:* Champion, 1923. vi + 282 pp. Fr. 15.

—— Essai d'introduction à une étude lexicologique de Michelet. Diss. *Paris:* Champion, 1923. iii + 51 pp. Fr. 10.

Shanks and Méras:—French composition for Colleges. *New York:* Harcourt, Brace, 1924. ix + 253 pp.

Souvestre, E. — L'éclusier, ed. by T. H. Bertenshaw. *New York:* Longmans, Green, 1923. 48 pp. 25 cts.

Stéphane, M. — L'aventure de Jacques Gérard, ed. by T. H. Bertenshaw. *New York:* Longmans, Green, 1923. 36 pp. 15 cts.

Villey, P. — Les Grands Ecrivains du XVIe siècle. Evolution des œuvres et invention de formes littéraires. I. Marot et Rabelais. *Paris:* Champion, 1923. xvii + 431 pp. Fr. 25.

ITALIAN

Alfieri, Vittorio.—Filippo, tragedia. *Bologna-Rocca S. Casciano:* L. Cappelli, 1923. 45 pp. L. 1.

—— Saul, tragedia. *Bologna-Rocca S. Casciano:* L. Cappelli, 1923. 48 pp. L. 1.

Anchora, C.—Per il VI centenario di Dante. Discorso letto al circolo cittadino di Galatina. *Galatina:* Tip. Mariano, 1923. xxxi pp. L. 2.

Antona-Traversi, C.—Briciole foscoliane. *Città di Castello:* Casa ed. "Il Solco," 1923. 142 pp. L. 6.

Bellorini, E.—Giuseppe Giusti. *Roma:* A. F. Formíggini, 1923. 103 pp. L. 3.50. (Profili, n. 66.)

Boccaccio, Giovanni.—Il Decameron, riscontrato co' migliori testi e con note di P. Fanfani, E. Camerini ed altri. *Milano:* Sonzogno, 1923. 2 vols., 340, 383 pp.

Cadorna, Carla.—Il cantore della povertà: Jacopone da Todi (1228-1308). *Firenze:* Libr. ed. Fiorentina, 1923. 218 pp.

Cocchia, E.—Saggi glottologici. Contributo allo studio del latino arcaico. *Napoli:* Rondinella e Loffredo, 1924. 364 pp. L. 35. (Biblioteca di "Mouseion," IV.)

Della Porta, G. B.—Grammatica friulana pratica. *Udine:* D. Del Bianco e figlio, 1922. vi + 51 pp.

Di Breme, Lodovico. — Polemiche. Intorno all' ingiustizia di alcuni giudizi letterari italiani. Il Giaurro di Lord Byron. Postille al Londonio. Introduzione e note di C. Calcaterra. *Torino:* Unione tipografico-editrice, 1923. cxii + 217 pp. L. 12. (Collezione di classici italiani con note, XXI.)

Farci, F.—Un filosofo poeta di Sardegna: Antioco Zucca. *Cagliari:* Soc. tip. Sarda, 1923. 35 pp.

Gilli, Ilda.—Niccolò Tommaseo. *Perugia:* G. Tilli, 1923. 61 pp.

Goldoni, Carlo.—Il bugiardo: commedia in tre atti. *Bologna-Rocca S. Casciano:* L. Cappelli, 1923. 58 pp. L. 1.

—— Un curioso accidente: commedia in tre atti. *Bologna-Rocca S. Casciano:* L. Cappelli, 1923. 48 pp. L. 1.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

Grandgent, C. H. — Discourses on Dante. *Cambridge:* Harvard University Press, 1924. vii + 201 pp. $2.25.

Leopardi, Giacomo. — Puerili e abbozzi vari, a cura di A. Donati. *Bari:* G. Laterza e figli, 1924. 294 pp. L. 20. (Scrittori d'Italia, no. 91; Opere di G. Leopardi, X.)

Machiavelli, Niccolò.—Il principe. A cura di A. Pompeati. *Torino:* Paravia, 1923. xxiv + 98 pp. L. 6.50. (Biblioteca di classici italiani.)

Maione, I.—Studi e saggi di letteratura. *Bologna:* N. Zanichelli, 1923. 311 pp. L. 15.

Manzoni, Alessandro, il poeta della rigenerazione cristiana della patria e della società. Commemorazione manzoniana, Cavatigozzi, 29 luglio 1923. *Cremona:* Unione tip. cremonese, 1923. 16 pp. L. 1.

Naselli, Maria.—La fortuna del Foscolo nell' ottocento. *Firenze:* F. Perrella, 1923. 441 pp. L. 35.

Parini, Giuseppe.—Il Giorno. Ridotto ed annotato da G. Finzi. *Torino:* Paravia, 1923. 141 pp. L. 4.75. (Biblioteca di classici italiani.)

Policastro, G.—Il teatro siciliano. *Catania:* V. Giannotta, 1923. 82 pp. L. 6.

Prearo, Angela.—Classicismo ed originalità nella poesia di Giacomo Zanella. *Vicenza:* G. Galla, 1923. 114 pp.

Robertson, J. G.—Studies in the Genesis of Romantic Theory in the Eighteenth Century. *Cambridge:* University Press, 1923. vii + 298 pp. 12sh. 6d.

Spreafico, A. — La topografia dei "Promessi Sposi" nel territorio di Lecco. *Lecco:* E. Bartolozzi, 1923. 131 pp.

Torriani, T. — La fortuna degli pseudonimi. *Roma:* Maglione e Strini, 1923. 87 pp. L. 5.

Vittone, M.—Analisi comparata delle due lingue italiana e francese col soccorso della lettura e del dettato. Parte I. *Torino:* A. Arduino, 1923. 205 pp. L. 12.

SPANISH

Alonso Cortés, N. — Fábulas castellanas. Selección hecha por —. *Valladolid:* Impr. del Colegio Santiago, 1923. 140 pp.

Canto popular, El —. Documentos para el estudio del folklore argentino. Publicación costeada por la donación Madariaga. *Buenos Aires:* Impr. "Coni," 1923. 33 pp. (Facultad de Filosofía y Letras de la Universidad de Buenos Aires. Instituto de Literatura Argentina. Sección folklore, IV. 1.)

Castillejo, Cristóbal de.—Diálogo de mujeres (1544). Wieder abgedruckt von L. Pfandl. *New York-Paris:* 1921. 68 pp. (Reprinted from the "Revue hispanique," LIII.)

Cervantes Saavedra, Miguel de. — Historia Dómini Quijoti Manchegui traducta in latinem macarrónicum per Ignatium Calvum. Cum prólogo Manoli L. Anaya. Editio nova, castigata et alargata. *Matriti:* Tip. Julii Cosano, 1922. 223 pp.

Cool, C. D.—Elementary Spanish Composition. *Boston:* Ginn and Co., 1924. viii + 111 pp. 68 cts.

Costa Alvarez, A. — Estudios sobre la Gramática americana de la lengua castellana. *Buenos Aires:* Impr. "Coni," 1923. 46 pp. (Reprinted from "Humanidades," VII, pp. 233-276.)

Diccionario gallego-castellano, por la Real Academia Gallega. *Coruña:* Impr. Roel. 1924. Pp. 337-352.

Jiménez Catalán, M., y Sinués y Urbiola, J.—Historia de la Real y Pontificia Universidad de Zaragoza. Obra premiada por el Patronato Villahermosa-Guaqui en el concurso 1920-21. Tomo I. *Zaragoza:* Tip. "La Académica," 1922. xxxiv + 430 pp.

Junta para ampliación de estudios e investigaciones científicas. Memoria correspondiente a los años 1920 y 1921. *Madrid:* 1922. xv + 336 pp.

Lacalle, A. — Mio Cid. Glosas. *Madrid:* Est. tip. de Pérez Torres, 1923. 80 pp.

Loa, Una — colonial en honor de Carlos III (1761). *Buenos Aires:* Impr. "Coni," 1923. 19 pp. (Facultad de Filosofía y Letras de la Universidad de Buenos Aires. Instituto de Literatura Argentina. Sección de documentos. Tomo I.)

Lope de Vega. — La Estrella de Sevilla. Formerly attributed to —. Edited with introduction, notes, and vocabulary by H. Thomas. *New York:* Oxford University Press, 1923. xxviii + 168 pp. $1.70.

Memorias de la Facultad de Filosofía y Letras, Universidad de Zaragoza. Tomo I. *Zaragoza:* Tip. "La Académica," 1922. xv + 518 + ix pp.

Onís, F. de.—Jacinto Benavente. Estudio literario. *New York:* Instituto de las Españas en los Estados Unidos, 1923. 73 pp.

Roa, A. — Spanish Business Grammar. *New York:* Appleton (1923). 543 pp. $4.00.

Rojas, R. — Un dramaturgo olvidado. Don Francisco Fernández y sus obras dramáticas. *Buenos Aires:* Impr. "Coni," 1923. 23 pp. (Facultad de Filosofía y Letras de la Universidad de Buenos Aires. Instituto de Literatura Argentina. Sección de crítica. Tomo I, núm. 1.)

Silvela, F.—Artículos, discursos, conferencias y cartas. Notas de Félix de Llanos y Torriglia. Tomo III. *Madrid:* Mateu Artes Gráficas, 1923. 463 pp.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

Volume XXXIX JUNE, 1924 Number 6

MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES

EDITED BY

JAMES WILSON BRIGHT, Editor-in-Chief

GUSTAV GRUENBAUM WILLIAM KURRELMEYER

H. CARRINGTON LANCASTER

CONTENTS

LOOMIS, R. S.—Bleheris and the Tristram Story, - - - - - - 319

STENBERG, T. T.—Ibsen's 'Catilina' and Goethe's 'Iphigenie auf Tauris,' 329

POTTER, G. R.—Thomas Chatterton's 'Epistle to the Reverend Mr. Catcott,' - - - - - - - - - - - - - 336

AUSTIN, H. D.—Dante Notes, IV, - - - - - - - - 338

CRAWFORD, A. W.—The Apparitions in 'Macbeth,' - - - - - 345

Reviews:—

FRIEDRICH KLUGE, Etymologisches Wörterbuch der deutschen Sprache. [*W. Kurrelmeyer.*] - - - - - - - - - - - 350

G. MILLARDET, Linguistique et Dialectologie romanes. [*C. Gilli*] - - 357

FRANCIS A. LITZ, Father Tabb: A Study of his Life and Works. [*K. Campbell.*] . - - - - - - - - - - - - - 361

ALBERT SCHINZ, Eighteenth Century Readings. [*G. Chinard.*] - - 363

BAUWENS, J., La Tragédie française et le théâtre hollandais au dix-septième siècle. I. [*H. C. Lancaster.*] - - - - - - 364

Hauptfragen der Romanistik. Festschrift für Ph. A. Becker. [*O. Müller.*] 367

Correspondence:—

BELL, C. H., *Helmbrecht*, 1251, - - - - - - - - - 372

COOK, A. S., Chaucer and Venantius Fortunatus, - - - - - - 376

STURTEVANT, A. M., Old Norse *Sko*, - - - - - - - - 378

BRIGGS, W. D., First Song in *The Beggar's Bush*, - - - - - 379

WOODBRIDGE, B. M., Sylvestre Bonnard's Fairy Again. - - - - 380

Brief Mention:—

CHARLES H. HASKINS, The Rise of Universities;—Schriften der Kleist-Gesellschaft, Band 2, - - - - - - - - - - - 381

THE JOHNS HOPKINS PRESS
BALTIMORE

Eight Numbers a Year — Single Copy (Current) Sixty-five Cents

Entered as Second-Class Matter at the Baltimore, Maryland, Postoffice

Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103, Act of October 3, 1917. Authorized on July 3, 1918

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES

A MONTHLY PUBLICATION with intermission from July to October (inclusive)

This publication is devoted to linguistic and literary research and to æsthetic and philosophic criticism in the domain of English, German, and the related Germanic Languages; and of French, Italian, Spanish, and the other Languages of the Romance Group. Its purpose is also to promote sound methods in the teaching of the Modern Languages and Literatures.

The Subscription Price of the current annual volume is $5.00 for the United States and Mexico; Canada $5.25 and $5.50 for other countries included in the Postal Union.

Contributors and Publishers will please address matter for the English Department of the *Notes* to James W. Bright; for the German Department to William Kurrelmeyer; for the French Department to H. Carrington Lancaster; for the Italian and Spanish Departments to Gustav Gruenbaum. Other matter may be sent to the Editor-in-Chief. The address of all the editors is Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md.

Subscriptions and other business communications should be sent to the Johns Hopkins Press, Baltimore, Md.

PREPARATION OF COPY

All copy should be in typewritten form.

Underscore (for italics) all titles of books, periodicals, poems, plays and other separately published compositions.

Use numerals in designating foot-notes, and number foot-notes in unbroken sequence.

Use roman numerals for volume-reference, set off by a comma before a following page-reference.

LA ESTRELLA DE SEVILLA
formerly attributed to LOPE DE VEGA
edited with introduction, notes, and vocabulary by
H. THOMAS, D. Litt.

LA ESTRELLA DE SEVILLA is a recognized masterpiece of the Spanish National Theatre founded by Lope de Vega, though the play is no longer attributed to him. It tells a famous story of Southern Spain in which the clash of duty and inclination provide an essentially dramatic theme. It is a model of construction, and illustrates many of the special features which characterize the Spanish drama of the period corresponding to our Elizabethan era.

Edited by J. FITZMAURICE KELLY
OXFORD SPANISH TEXTS
Plain Texts. Fcap 8vo

Iriarte, Fábulas Literarias. Samaniego, Fábulas en Verso. Garcilaso, Poesías Varias. Garcilaso, Églogas. Quintana, El Cid y Guzmán el Bueno.

Annotated Texts. Fcap 8vo

Quintana, El Cid y Guzmán el Bueno. Edited by José Plá.
Florida (La), Trozos Escogidos. Edited by Julia Fitzmaurice-Kelly.
Sierra, Canción de Cuna. Edited by Rachel Alcock.
Lope de Vega, Carpio. Shortly.

OXFORD SPANISH SERIES. Cr. 8vo

Elementary Spanish Grammar. By B. Sanin Cano. Also a Key.
Spanish Reader. With Notes and Vocabulary. By B. Sanin Cano.
Spanish Literature. A Primer. By James Fitzmaurice-Kelly.
Spanish Composition. Through reading. By John Rawson Elder. Also a Key.

OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS
American Branch
35 WEST 32ND STREET, NEW YORK

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES

VOLUME XXXIX JUNE, 1924 NUMBER 6

BLEHERIS AND THE TRISTRAM STORY

Miss Schoepperle concluded her *Tristan and Isolt* with these words: "On the question of the channel of transmission of the tradition from the Celts to the French, it seems premature, in our present knowledge of the history and literature of the Celtic countries in the Middle Ages, to pronounce." [1] In the very paragraph preceding, however, she referred to a clue which, the more I consider it, seems the more significant. "Another mooted question is the interpretation of the passage in Thomas in regard to Breri. We agree with M. Bédier in seeing in this a mere device on the part of Thomas to cover his modifications of the tradition by citing as his source a name which, it appears, enjoyed no slight reputation among his hearers as an authority on Arthurian romance." Although I concur in this interpretation of Thomas's reference, I believe it can be shown that Thomas referred to a historical person who fully deserved his reputation at the Angevin court as a fountainhead of the Tristram legend. The greater part of the evidence has already been set forth by Miss Weston; [2] but I hope to present

[1] G. Schoepperle, *Tristan and Isolt* (Frankfurt and London, 1913), II, 475.

[2] *Romania*, XXXIV (1905), 100; J. L. Weston, *Legend of Sir Perceval* (London, 1906-9), I, 288, II, 250; *From Ritual to Romance* (London, 1920), 180; *Revue Celtique*, XXXII (1911), 5. The thesis proposed in this last article, that Bleheris the *conteur* is to be identified with a certain Bledri ap Cadivor, a Welsh chieftain, seems highly improbable. For other discussions of Bleheris see *Romania*, VIII (1879), 425; XXV (1896), 23; XXVIII (1899), 336; XXXIII (1904), 334; XLIII (1914), 126; *Göttingische Gelehrte Anzeigen*, I (1890), 804; *Z. F. S. L.*, XIII[1] (1891), 84; XXXI[2] (1907), 141; XXXVI[2] (1910), 187; Bédier, *Tristan de Thomas* (Paris,

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

it and supplement it in such fashion that what has hitherto seemed to many scholars an interesting hypothesis may come to be regarded as a well-grounded fact in literary history. I believe, moreover, that if we accept the evidence regarding Breri or Bleheris, he becomes a figure of primary importance in the development of the *matière de Bretagne.*

What are the links connecting Breri or Bleheris with the Tristram story? In the first place, let me quote in full Thomas's citation:

Entre ceus qui solent cunter
E del cunte Tristran parler,
Il en cuntent diversement:
Oi en ai de plusur gent.
Asez sai que chescun en dit
E ço qu'il unt mis en escrit,
Mes sulun ço que j'ai oi,
Nel dient pas sulun Breri,
Ky solt les gestes e les cuntes
De tuz les reis, de tuz les cuntes
Ki orent esté en Bretaingne. (Ll. 2113-2123).

The name which appears as Bleheris in one MS. of Pseudo-Wauchier's continuation of *Perceval* appears as Bleobleheris or Bliobliheri in others.[3] In this latter form we find the name again associated with Tristram. Crestien de Troyes in *Erec* gives a list of Arthur's knights:

Et Tristanz qui ne onques rist
Delez Bliobleheris sist. (Ll. 1713 f.).

In the *Elucidation,* a late prologue attached to Crestien's *Perceval,* we hear that this same knight, Blihos-Bliheris, possessed a certain talent rarely, if ever, ascribed in medieval romance to a man of knightly rank:

Mais si tres bons contes savoit
Que nus ne se peust lasser
De ses paroles escouter.[4]

1902-5), II, 95; J. Loth, *Mabinogion*[2] (Paris, 1913), I, 72; *Contributions à l'étude des romans de la Table Ronde* (Paris, 1912), 34; *Revue Celtique,* XXXIII (1912), 180; E. Levi, *I lais e la leggenda di Tristano* (extract from *Studi Romanzi,* No. 14), Perugia (1918), 69.

[3] J. L. Weston, *Legend of Sir Perceval,* I, 241, note.

[4] *Ibid.,* I, 277, 290.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

The form Bliobleheris is clearly to be accounted for as a corruption of Bleheris through written transmission. At some stage a copyist has failed to note the dots under Blio by which a predecessor had tried to strike out his mistake in copying an unfamiliar name, and thus the blunder and the correct form were compounded into one name. Nevertheless, in spite of this disguise, Bleheris retained his association with Tristram and his professional renown.

Eilhart's *Tristrant* also contains its reminiscence of Bleheris. A minor character, corresponding to Thomas's Cariado, bears the name Pleherin, a form that is easily derived from Bleheris, as *P*ant from *B*an and Nam*p*etenis from Nain *B*edenis. This irresponsible christening of a minor character is quite in accord with the practice of one of Eilhart's predecessors, for, as M. Lot has shown,[5] the name of Mark's seneschal, Tinas de Litan, must have been a Welsh place-name, Dinas Lidan, meaning "strong fortress."

It is not only Thomas, then, who connected Bleheris with Tristram: in a curious way both Crestien and Eilhart testify to the same fact. Each testimony, too, is obviously independent of the others. Can these facts be explained on any other assumption than the existence of an original tradition which attributed to Bleheris a fundamental connection with the Tristram story?

As to Bleheris' origin there can be no doubt. Every scholar who has written on the subject has admitted that both Breri and Bleheris represent the Welsh name Bleðri. It was also as the author of a jest regarding the Welsh habit of fishing in portable coracles that Giraldus Cambrensis mentions Bledhericus (probably to be identified with Bleheris) as "famosus ille fabulator qui tempora nostra paulo praevenit."[6] That a Welshman should be a source of Continental Tristram romance fits in with the known popularity of that legend in Wales. Tristram appears in the *Mabinogion,* five triads, a tale, and some very obscure Welsh poetic fragments.[7] M. J. Loth has, moreover, asserted that the French form Tristan can be derived only from the Welsh, not from the Breton or Cornish.[8]

[5] *Romania,* XXIV (1895), 337.

[6] Giraldus Cambrensis, *Descriptio Cambriae,* ed. J. F. Dimock (London, 1868), 202.

[7] J. Loth, *Mabinogion*², I, 373, II, 254, 260, 270, 284, 291. J. Loth, *Contributions à l'étude,* 112. *Studies in Philology,* XVII (1920), 93.

[8] J. Loth, *Contributions à l'étude,* 95.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

If the origin of Bleheris was in Wales, have we any clue to his Continental activities? It is a fact that has been strangely overlooked that all the early evidences on the Tristram story outside of Wales point more or less directly toward Eleanor of Poitou. Thomas's poem (1185-1200) was, as I have shown elsewhere, written under the patronage of some member of the royal Angevin house, perhaps Eleanor herself.[9] Marie de France, who wrote *Chievrefoil,* dedicated her lais to a king, generally supposed to be Eleanor's husband, Henry II, though he may have been her son, the Young King.[10] Eilhart translated his *Tristrant* at the behest of Mathilda of Saxony, Eleanor's daughter. Crestien de Troyes, who says that he wrote "del roi Marc e Iseut la blonde," and whose poems, from *Erec* to *Lancelot,* are full of reminiscences of that story, wrote under the patronage of Marie de Champagne, another daughter of Eleanor's. Bernard de Ventadour, who often mentions Tristram in his poems, indulged an artificial passion for Eleanor. Indeed the earliest reference to Tristram which can be dated with some assurance is to be found in a poem of Bernard's apparently written, as Dr. Deister has demonstrated once more, after the departure of Eleanor for England in 1154.[11] Almost contemporary, perhaps a little earlier is the reference to Tristram in a poem of Cercamon's brought forward by Prof. Appel and dated not later than the fifties.[12] Now Cercamon was closely connected with Eleanor, for he wrote poems in celebration of her marriage with Louis VII in 1137 and lamenting the death of her father earlier in the same year. Six threads, therefore, connect the story of Tristram with Eleanor of Poitou. Especially noteworthy is the fact that Tristram is first mentioned in Contintental literature by two troubadours immediately associated with that romantic and influential woman. All this cannot be mere coincidence.

Let us now turn to the remarkable statement found in a single manuscript of Wauchier de Denain's continuation of *Perceval* and published by Miss Weston in 1905.[13] In a description of a dwarf knight Wauchier says:

[9] *M. L. R.*, XVII (1922), 24.

[10] *Nuovi studi medievali*, I.

[11] *M. P.*, XIX (1922), 287.

[12] *Z. R. Ph.*, XLI (1921), 223.

[13] *Romania*, XXXIV (1905), 100.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

Deviser vos voel sa faiture.
Si com le conte Bleheris
Qui fu nes e engenuis
En Gales dont je cont le conte
Et qui si le contoit au conte
De Poitiers qui amoit l'estoire
E le tenoit en grant memoire
Plus que nul autre ne faisoit.

When we note how completely the statements about Bleheris harmonise with the facts presented above; when we note that Wauchier had no connection with the house of Poitou and would have no motive for inventing such a tale; when Miss Weston points out that this passage occurs in a series of Gawain adventures which are often quite disconnected and contain frequent references to a *grand conte* from which they are drawn and frequent apostrophes to an audience in the manner of the *conteurs*,[14] we are surely justified in the belief that, however modified, this *Geste of Gawayne*, as Miss Weston calls it, represents a tradition going back to Bleheris, and gives us a true account of him.

Let us see why, though many scholars have admitted the existence of Bleheris and his reputation as a great authority on the *matière de Bretagne*, so few have taken seriously his connection with any particular body of Arthurian romance and his visit to the court of Poitou with its far-reaching consequences. In the first place, Miss Weston marshalled no corroborative evidence connecting him through the Tristram legend with Eleanor of Poitou. In the second place, there was the suspicion, amounting almost to certainty, that Thomas justified his own originality by a false appeal to Bleheris. But, because Wolfram von Eschenbach cites Crestien falsely as the source of his *Willehalm*, and because the ascription of the prose *Lancelot* to Walter Map is a hoax, must we conclude that Crestien de Troyes and Walter Map never existed? No more does the fact that Thomas was "spoofing" in his appeal to the authority of Bleheris prove or even render it more probable that Bleheris never existed. This same passage of Thomas has been subjected to criticism by M. Foulet,[15] who believes that the

[14] Weston, *Legend of Sir Perceval*, I, 232-252.
[15] *M. L. N.*, XXIII (1908), 205.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

reference to the *conteurs* and their varying versions of the romance was a mere imitation of the lines in Marie de France's *Chievrefoil*: "Plusur le m'unt cunté et dit Et jeo l'ai trouvé en escrit De Tristram et de la reine." Now there is no such verbal similarity between this and Thomas's lines quoted above as to force the conclusion that one was copied from the other. And I believe M. Foulet's whole thesis that there were no *conteurs* of Arthurian themes in the second half of the twelfth century falls to the ground before this quotation from Peter of Blois, Thomas's contemporary: "Recitantur etiam pressurae vel injuriae eidem crudeliter irrogatae, sicut de Arthuro et Gauganno et Tristanno fabulosa quaedam referunt histriones, quorum auditu concutiuntur ad compassionem audientium corda et usque ad lacrimas compunguntur." [16] There are plenty of other witnesses, but this statement alone, coming from one who was certainly not exploiting the Arthurian legend, suffices to prove that Thomas and the others who refer to the *conteurs* were simply telling the truth. The scepticism of many scholars regarding the Breri passage has certainly been carried too far. And when we find a body of evidence, so curiously consistent, regarding the provenance and transmission of the Tristram legend, Wauchier's statement regarding Bleheris may well be regarded as established.

Who was the "conte de Poitiers" to whom Bleheris told his tales? I believe that Miss Weston was right when she first identified him with William VIII, father of Eleanor of Poitou and son of the famous troubadour-crusader William VII.[17] William VIII's death in 1137 was the occasion for elegies by both Cercamon and Marcabru. Cercamon, as we have seen, was either the first or the second Continental writer to mention Tristram. Marcabru, according to one MS. of his elegy on Count William, mentions Arthur: "Serai mai cum Artus perdutz." [18] In the light of Bleheris' activity, may we not regard this reading as the original? And can we not better understand that infiltration of Provençal literature with Celtic themes which Prof. Levi has revealed? [19]

[16] Migne, *Pat. Lat.*, CCVII, col. 1088. Cited by E. Levi, *I lais e la leggenda di Tristano*, 103.

[17] *Romania*, XXXIV (1905), 100.

[18] *Romania*, VI (1877), 123 f.

[19] E. Levi, *I lais e la leggenda di Tristano*, 58-77.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

William VIII reigned from 1127 to 1137: and this decade was doubtless the period of Bleheris' momentous visit.

How momentous it was Miss Weston herself seems hardly to have realised. It was not that the Arthurian legend had not been known before this on the Continent. Prof. Rajna long since called attention to the names Artusius and Galvanus found in North Italian documents of the early twelfth century.[20] Artusius occurs as early as 1114, and the man must have been christened at least fifteen years earlier. Furthermore, I shall demonstrate in an article to be published elsewhere that the Arthurian sculpture at Modena was carved between 1099 and 1106, that the sculptor came from Bari, and that at Bari the Duke of Brittany and other Breton nobles spent the winter of 1096-7.[21] I shall also produce a mass of evidence to show that the carving illustrates a Breton version of the Meleagant abduction, with Gawain in the role of chief rescuer. When in 1136 Geoffrey of Monmouth said that the deeds of Arthur "a multis populis quasi inscripta iucunde et memoriter praedicarentur,"[21b] he was telling the sober truth.

The achievement of Bleheris, then, lies not in introducing Arthur to the non-Celtic world, but in introducing a story of extra-marital passion to the very center of the cult of courtly love. The theories with which the Midi was aflame and which the troubadours celebrated in lyric form, Bleheris exemplified in his burning tale of Tristram and Ysolt. To him, we may believe, Eleanor owed her marked devotion to that particular romance which we may justly infer from the predilections of her daughters, of her poet-lover, and of the Angevin court. To Bleheris must be in large measure due the momentous fact that courtly love found in the *matière de Bretagne* its narrative vehicle.

[20] *Romania*, XVII (1888), 161, 355. M. Faral's suggestion in his *Recherches sur les sources latines* (Paris, 1913), 396, that Artusius comes, not from Artus, but from Hartewic, shows to what desperate straits he is driven to support his system.

[21] A. K. Porter, *Lombard Architecture* (New Haven, 1915-17), I, 434-8; A K. Porter, *Romanesque Sculpture* (Boston, 1923), I, 67; *Art Studies*, I, 1923, 12; C. W. David, *Robert Curthose* (Cambridge, Mass., 1920), 97.

[21b] This certainly correct form of the verb from MS. Univ. Coll. Camb. I. i. 114 was generously supplied by the Rev. Acton Griscom, who is preparing a critical text of Geoffrey of Monmouth.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

The *Elucidation* probably preserves an authentic tradition when it says of Blihos-Bleheris that

> **Si tres bons contes savoit**
> **Que nus ne se peust lasser**
> **De ses paroles escouter.**

Bleheris may have owed his charm in part to that delicate and luxuriant fancy of the Celt which flowered in *Kulhwch and Olwen*. Since the *conteurs* are referred to indiscriminately as *histriones* and *mimi,* they must have recited their tales with a good deal of dramatic action. Probably Bleheris included among his gifts the power of vivid impersonation. It does not seem likely that he should have won the distinction of being the only transmitter of Arthurian romance from the Celts to the non-Celtic world whose name has been preserved unless he had been a man of genius.

What was the story of Tristram as Bleheris told it? At present no assured answer seems possible. Miss Schoepperle has furnished Celtic parallels for a large number of incidents,[22] and we may properly assume that these would have been included in Bleheris' version. I feel quite certain that Arthur and his knights figured in it, for these are already attached to the story in a Welsh triad, and it is not until we reach the comparatively late romance of Thomas that we find him excluding the Arthurian connections. The real problem is whether the legend already included Ysolt of Brittany. My recent discoveries in Arthurian nomenclature have convinced me that much Welsh tradition reached Brittany as early as the eleventh century, was amplified by the Bretons and by them given such prestige on the Continent and in England that the Welsh received back their own legends and their own heroes in Breton disguise by the beginning of the twelfth century. For example, the name Gwalchmai is not the original Welsh name for Gawain, but a Welsh attempt to reproduce the Breton corruption of the original Welsh sobriquet for this hero. It seems probable that the Tristram story had also been through this cycle of development. At least, we find a Tristan, lord of Vitré, early in the eleventh century.[23] Morice's transcript of the records from the

[22] G. Schoepperle, *Tristan and Isolt*, II, 471.

[23] Pierre le Baud, *Chroniques de Vitré* (bound with *Histoire de Bre-*

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

first half of the century supply also a Triscannus who later became a bishop and a Triscan abbas; in both cases we may safely read Tristan.[24] It seems probable then that the legend of this hero was known in Brittany early in the eleventh century; that there the story of Ysolt of the White Hands was invented and developed; and that it was this already expanded legend that Bleheris knew and brought to Poitiers.

Let me before closing indicate briefly the relation of my theory to other notable theories of the development of the tradition. I agree with Miss Schoepperle's view that Eilhart's source, the *estoire*, is the most primitive form of the romance we know, but that there were earlier French versions now lost.[25] With M. F. Lot, however, I find her arguments for the late date of the courtly love elements in the *estoire* unconvincing.[26] If the interpretation which Prof. Appel places on the allusion to Tristan by Cercamon be correct, courtly ideas were present in the story as early as the fifties.[27] Some of them we may believe were due to Bleheris. M. Bédier's theory of a French archetype differs from mine mainly in that though we may take Bleheris for its author, I believe he found much of the material ready to hand and that there were a number of episodic accretions later.[28] Gaston Paris's theory of Anglo-Norman transmission to the Continent, tentatively subscribed to by M. Bédier, is unsupported by any cogent reasons.[29] All the English connections of the Tristram story are later than the connections with Poitou, and are easily explained by another hypothesis. Cer-

tagne) (Paris, 1638), 5. H. Morice, *Mémoires pour servir de preuves à l'histoire de Bretagne* (Paris, 1742), transcribes the name from the documents in the following forms: I, 370, Trescandi, Triscandi; 372, Trischan; 382, Triscanni; 386, Driscamni; 387, Driscanus; 408, Trescandi. I believe that Le Baud who had access to original materials now lost was right in reading Tristan, and that Morice has made the easy mistake of reading a *c* for a *t* in each case. The supposed examples of the name Tristan among the Normans of Sicily in the eleventh century are all misreadings of the name of Thorstein. See *M. L. N*, XXIV (1907), 37.

[24] H. Morice, *Mémoires pour servir de preuves*, I, 353, 372.

[25] G. Schoepperle, *Tristan and Isolt*, I, 8 ff.

[26] *Romania*, XLIII (1914), 128.

[27] *Z. R. Ph.*, XLI (1921), 224.

[28] Bédier, *Tristan de Thomas*, II, 155.

[29] *Ibid.*, 126-9.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

tainly the episode in the *Roman de Renard,* and probably Marie's *Chievrefoil,* Béroul, and Thomas are to be dated after 1175.[30] Béroul's use of the word *lovendrinc* and the English words put in the mouth of Renard disguised as a Breton jongleur seem to mean only that the *conteurs,* whose activity in the second half of the twelfth century I have defended above, circulated in England as well as on the Continent and naturally picked up some English expressions. M. J. Loth's theory of Cornish provenance has been adequately criticised by M. Smirnov.[31] The names Blanche Lande and Mal Pas are by no means confined to Cornwall. Dinas de Lidan is as likely to be Welsh as Cornish. Kaherdin is a Turkish name made familiar by the Crusades.[32] The one convincing identification is Lancien with its church of S. Sanson, and these are found only in Béroul. Does not the natural explanation of this placing of Mark's court at Lancien, which seems to have no historic or legendary justification, lie in the supposition that Béroul or his source, like other *conteurs* of his day, visited England and merely invented a localization of the legend? There is nothing, therefore, in the extant French romances of Tristram which seems incompatible with the theory that the legend came from Wales, was newly vitalised by Bleheris, and from Poitiers spread northward through France and England.

If the claims that I have made for Bleheris are accepted, it is hard to overestimate his importance. It is not the Arthurian legend of Geoffrey of Monmouth which has peopled the dreams of poets for eight centuries. As Gaston Paris once said, the French verse romances "ne doivent rien à Gaufrei de Monmouth." [33] And

[30] *Nuovi studi medievali,* I. J. D. Bruce, *Evolution of Arthurian Romance* (Baltimore and Göttingen), 1923, I, 159. I hope to establish the date of Thomas between 1185 and 1200 in a sequel to this article.

[31] J. Loth, *Contributions à l'étude de la Table Ronde,* 60. *Romania,* XLIII (1914), 121.

[32] *Z. R. Ph.,* XLIII (1922), 482.

[33] *Romania,* X (1881), 488. M. Faral in Bédier and Hazard, *Histoire illustrée de la littérature française* (Paris, 1923), 19, has enunciated the opposite opinion: "Dans la mesure où ceux-ci doivent quelquechose à une autre source que la seule imagination de leurs auteurs, ce n'est pas à des poèmes celtiques qu'ils se rattachent; c'est à une œuvre de clerc": namely, Geoffrey of Monmouth. One wonders whether M. Faral has ever

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

it is mainly from them that Arthurian romance derives. Crestien de Troyes has ceased to be, for those who have examined without prejudice the accumulated evidence, more than a charming *remanieur*. His *Ivain, Erec, Lancelot,* and *Perceval* are simply refined but very close redactions of earlier French *contes* of ultimate Breton origin. When, as in *Lancelot,* he introduces at his patroness's request the scenes and the ideas illustrative of *amour courtois,* he is doing only what others had done before. But Bleheris, we have reason to believe, was an innovator. To him we may give the credit of first mingling colorful Celtic fantasy with the Provençal idealisation of love. To him, more than any other, we may attribute the fact that, according to Andreas Capellanus, the laws of *amour courtois* were discovered in Arthur's court.[34]

Columbia University. ROGER SHERMAN LOOMIS.

IBSEN'S *CATILINA* AND GOETHE'S *IPHIGENIE AUF TAURIS*

Some years ago, after having translated Ibsen's *Catilina* (the revised edition) into English, I read all the dramas of Oehlenschlaeger, Schiller, and Goethe, in order, if possible, to find new points of contact between the works of these writers and Ibsen's first drama. In Oehlenschlaeger I found some evidence of Ibsen's being indebted to *Kiartan og Gudrun,* which evidence I have already summarized in print (*Journal of English and Germanic Philology,* XXII, 158). In Schiller I found nothing that had not been pointed out by earlier investigators. In Goethe's *Götz von Berlichingen* I found a few matters that suggested *Catilina*; but these I had found also in Oehlenschlaeger, whom we know that Ibsen had read before the time in question (See Henrik Jaeger, *Henrik Ibsen,* W. M. Payne's translation, second edition, 49.).

heard of the Cath Paluc, of Merlin and Lailoken, or has compared *Gawain and the Green Knight,* certainly based on a French romance, with its Irish parallel.

[34] I wish to express my gratitude for certain suggestions as to wording and treatment of materials made me by Professor Nitze and Professor Hibbard.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

When I came to Goethe's *Iphigenie auf Tauris,* however, I found what I felt to be a direct and considerable influence. Again and again, situations or passages reminded me of *Catilina.*

According to Ibsen's Introduction to the revised edition of the drama, *Catilina* was written in the winter of 1848-49, in the twenty-first year of his life. In taking the university entrance examination in 1850, Ibsen received the grade of "meget godt" (very good) in German,—a higher grade than he received in any other subject (See table in Rudolph Lothar's *Henrik Ibsen,* 18.). It is likely, therefore, that he had read several German classics by the time that he wrote *Catilina.* And since the *Iphigenie* is in blank verse, as is also *Catilina,* it is not unlikely that he was interested in this polished drama, as well as in Oehlenschlaeger, while trying his hand for the first time at this kind of writing.

During his Grimstad period (1844-50), Ibsen was carrying on studies in preparation for the university entrance examination, and was tutored (to what extent is not known) by two theological students, S. C. Monrad and Emil Bie (J. B. Halvorsen, *Norsk Forfatter-Lexikon,* III, 6). That these men may have interested him in one of the best German classics, if indeed he needed to be interested, is probable. But there is also another possibility. The druggist to whom he was apprenticed the first two years of his Grimstad period was a German, or at least had the German name J. A. Reimann (Halvorsen, *op. cit.,* 6). Being a druggist, his employer must have had a fair education, and may have assisted in introducing Ibsen to Goethe. At any rate, according to Halvorsen, the druggist took considerable interest in his apprentice (*op. cit.,* 6).

We have also a bit of valuable testimony bearing on the point in question. John Paulsen, who "aspires, in a measure, to be Ibsen's Boswell" (Edmund Gosse, *Henrik Ibsen,* x), says concerning Ibsen: "De tyske klassikere som Goethe og Schiller var han fortrolig med allerede fra sin ungdom" (Samliv med Ibsen, 29). My translation: "The German classic writers, such as Goethe and Schiller, he was familiar with already in his youth." Professor Halvdan Koht, who has had occasion to study the Ibsen sources in editing *Breve fra Ibsen* and Ibsen's *Efterladte Skrifter,* accepts Paulsen's statement at its face value (*Efterladte Skrifter,* LX). Now, if Ibsen was "fortrolig" with Goethe already in his youth, it is not difficult to believe that he may have read the

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

Iphigenie before reaching the age of twenty-one. And it may be added that Paulsen's statement is in part substantiated by the fact that Ibsen at the age of twenty-two received a higher grade in German than in any other subject. Paulsen's statement is, however, the testimony of an admirer, and should probably be taken with a grain of salt. But, when all is said, it is important supplementary evidence.

That Ibsen, during his life as a whole, was profoundly influenced by Goethe, is certain. Paulsen says: "Som Goethe saa op til Shakespeare, af hvem han drog sin fornemste naering, har Ibsen studeret Goethe og ikke uden udbytte. Ibsen talte sjeldent om Goethe, som han skyldte saa meget, men naar han naevnte ham, var det altid med beundring" (*Samliv med Ibsen,* 72). My translation: "Just as Goethe looked up to Shakespeare, from whom he drew his chief nourishment, so Ibsen studied Goethe, and not without profit. Ibsen seldom talked about Goethe, whom he owed so much; but when he referred to him, it was always with admiration." This influence has been noted by a number of scholars, particularly as it manifests itself in *Peer Gynt* (1867). Ibsen's indebtedness to Goethe in *Peer Gynt* has received full and careful treatment at the hands of Professor A. LeRoy Andrews, in his article entitled "Ibsen's *Peer Gynt* and Goethe's *Faust*" (*Journal of English and Germanic Philology,* XIII, 238 ff.).

It is not improbable, then, that Ibsen's *Catilina* owes something to Goethe's *Iphigenie auf Tauris.* I shall now set forth a number of parallels and similarities, which, in my judgment, constitute almost positive proof of such indebtedness. My quotations are from the Goedeke edition of *Goethes Werke* and the first edition of *Catilina.* The numbers inclosed by parentheses indicate pages.

In her first speeches, Iphigenie is bewailing her lot as priestess in the temple of Diana. Likewise, in her first speeches, Furia, Ibsen's heroine, is bewailing her lot as priestess in the temple of Vesta. Both lament the fact that they have been deprived of the pleasures of youth. I can quote only a few lines. Compare the following, both in sentiment and in language. Iphigenie's words:

Sie war dahin,
Der Jugend beste Freude, das Gedeihn
Der ersten Jahre. Selbst gerettet, war
Ich nur ein Schatten mir, und frische Lust
Des Lebens blüht in mir nicht wieder auf. (10)

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

Furia's words:

som röved mig enhver min Ungdomsglaede,
i Livets skjönne Vaar hver skyldfri Lyst;— (17)

Iphigenie refers to her life in the temple as "the second death":

Auch von dem Leben hier, dem zweiten Tode! (8)

And a little further on:

Ein unnütz Leben ist ein früher Tod; (10)

Furia says, concerning this same life:

og denne tomme, handlingslöse Virken,
et Liv saa mat, som Lampens sidste Blus, (18)

Further on Furia says to Catiline:

hist venter Dig en stille Eensomhed,—
et Liv, halvt Döden, halvt en dösig Slummer,— (54)

And Catiline says, concerning his own life:

men dette er jo Döden uden Liv! (49)

Except towards the end of the drama, Orestes, Iphigenie's brother, is distracted, and imagines himself pursued by the Furies. This is largely true also of Catiline. The following words, spoken by Catiline, are quite in keeping with the state of mind of Orestes:

man siger jo, at Furierne stige
fra Underverdnen frem for at forfölge
den Dödelige;— (72)

Again:

og hvorsomhelst jeg gaaer,
forfölger mig saert vexlende Gestalter,—
Alt, Manlius, Alt huses i min Barm,
kuns ikke Fred;—den er der ikke mer. (88-89)

Again:

Hvad ville I mig da, I blege Skygger,
lad mig i Ro, hvad fordre I af mig? (118)

Before Orestes recognizes Iphigenie as his sister, he thinks she may be in league with the Furies:

So willst du mein Verderben?
Verbirgt in dir sich eine Rachegöttin? (46)

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

Compare Catiline's words to Furia:

Ha, er Du da en Daemon— (117)
Ha! Du er stegen frem
af Gravens Dyb for at forfölge mig— (49)
ha, saadan har jeg taenkt
mig Nemesis— (56)

Orestes addresses Iphigenie as

Schöne Nymphe, (47)

Catiline addresses Furia as

skjönne Svaermerinde! (19)
Skjönne Nemesis! (57)

Iphigenie says to Orestes:

Mein Schicksal ist an deines fest gebunden. (44)

Furia says to Catiline:

Jeg er din Genius—et saelsomt Baand
os sammenknytter— (51)
jeg er din Genius!
jeg maa ledsage Dig, hvorhen Du gaar— (49)
Jeg maa ledsage Dig
til Maalet. (106)
Jeg er din Genius, din lönnende Gudinde! (114)

Orestes says to Iphigenie:

Wer bist du, deren Stimme mir entsetzlich
Das Innerste in seinen Tiefen wendet? (46)

Catiline says to Furia:

ha, faelt din tale har
en haer af Billeder fremmanet i min Sjael— (118)
Du grebet har
en Streng, der toned dybest i mit Indre,— (55)
Ha! Furia! hvor saelsom er din Tale!
den klang som toner fra min egen Barm, (18)

Orestes urges Iphigenie to go back to Greece,

Ein neues Leben freundlich anzufangen. (43)

When Catiline and his wife, Aurelia, have decided to leave Rome, Aurelia says:

En ny Tilvaerelse for os frembryder, (47)

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

Catiline says to the conspirators:

> En ny Tilvaerelse os vinker naer— (68)

Orestes asks Iphigenie to kill him, just as Catiline asks Furia to kill him; and in each case the instrument to be used is the dagger ("dolch," "dolk").

Orestes comforts Iphigenie, saying that she should not feel responsible for his death. It is Fate that demands the sacrifice:

> Weine nicht! Du hast nicht Schuld. (48)

Catiline says to his friend, Curius, who has betrayed him, and thus becomes the indirect cause of his death:

> Du var kuns Midlet,—kunde du for det?— (98)

When Orestes imagines that he has died and is meeting the spirits of the underworld, he says to them:

> Ist keine Feindschaft hier mehr unter euch?
> Verlosch die Rache wie das Licht der Sonne? . . . .
> Wir sind hier alle der Feindschaft los.— (49)

Furia, who claims in this part of the drama to be a spirit from the underworld, has the same strange information to offer:

> I Graven svinder Hadet, (50)
> Steg nogen Aand fra Gravens Skygger frem
> med Had i Barmen? (51)

Soon after Iphigenie recognizes Orestes as her brother, she says:

> Allein zu tragen dieses Glück und Elend
> Vermag ich nicht. (48)

Compare Aurelia's words to Catiline:

> hvilken Fryd!
> o, mere end mit Bryst formaaer at rumme— (31-32)

In speaking of his falling in love with Iphigenie, King Thoas dwells on her "magic" influence over him. He was

> wie mit Zauberbanden
> Gefesselt. (23)

Compare Catiline's words to Furia, concerning her influence over him:

> En Tryllekraft mig faengsler til din Side— (21)
> der ligger dog en saelsom Tryllekraft
> i dine Ord, i dine dunkle Blikke! (52)

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

Compare Furia's view of the same matter:

Han mödte mig! en maegtig Tryllekraft—
en indre Sympathi os förte sammen;— (36)

Iphigenie refuses to rob the temple of Diana's statue and to flee back to Greece, because she would thus betray King Thoas's trust in her. And he has been her "second father":

Den König, der mein zweiter Vater ward, (62)
Den Konig, der mein zweiter Vater ward! (75)

When Furia asks Curius to betray Catiline, Curius at first finds it impossible for the same reason:

Ha, raedsomt! han, min Pleiefader og— (78)

Iphigenie says to King Thoas:

O reiche mir die Hand zum Friedenszeichen! (74)
und reiche mir
Zum Pfand der alten Freundschaft deine Rechte. (81)

Compare Furia's words to Catiline:

raek mig din Haand
til evigt Forbund,— (55-56)
Kom, raek mig Haanden til
et mörkt, et evigt Forbund.— (57)

Towards the end of the drama, Orestes tells Iphigenie that she has delivered him from the Furies and has brought back to him the "light of day":

Neu
Geniesz' ich nun durch dich das weite Licht
Des Tages. (79)

Compare Catiline's last words to Aurelia, spoken as Furia, his Fury, is disappearing in the background:

Du har Sjaelens Mulm forjaget, i mit Bryst er Ro, . . .
Du har Mörkets Magt beseiret ved din Kjaerlighed! (125)

All the units in the two following groups emphasize the necessity of immediate flight; and in the second group there is also a parallel between "wir sind verraten" and "Du er forraadt." Compare the elements of each group, both from the point of view of thought and of language.

Jeder Augenblick ist teuer, (51)
Spild ei Öieblikket. (104)

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

Din Tid er kostbar,— (103)
Saa lad os fly i dette Öieblik, (19)
Nu, saa afsted i dette Öieblik, (70)

Versäumt die Zeit nicht, die gemessen ist! (52)
Komm, wir sind verraten.
Geringer Raum bleibt uns zur Flucht. Geschwind! (75)
O nei, men red Dig, mens det end er Tid;—
Du er forraadt— (96)
Men skynd Dig, fly! vid, snart er det forsilde. (98)

These are the principal data which have led me to believe that Ibsen's *Catilina* owes a debt to Goethe's *Iphigenie auf Tauris.* I believe that Ibsen had studied the *Iphigenie* with great care. There is however nothing in *Catilina* which indicates that Ibsen was, necessarily, conscious of drawing upon Goethe.

Parallels and similarities do not constitute absolute proof of literary indebtedness. But if parallels and similarities are sufficiently numerous, it seems to me that they become significant; and especially is this the case if the influence they point toward is not improbable.

THEODORE T. STENBERG.

University of Texas.

THOMAS CHATTERTON'S *EPISTLE TO THE REVEREND MR. CATCOTT*

Chatterton's biographers and critics have taken little serious account of his *Epistle to the Reverend Mr. Catcott* (1769). C. E. Russell, for instance, in referring to the poem [1] says, "Chatterton had long made up his mind about religion"; and simply defines vaguely Chatterton's creed: "he had his own religion of faith and practice, dream and aspiration, but utterly rejected all the dogmas of the church and, indeed, all the supernatural parts of Christianity." J. H. Ingram [2] slides nonchalantly over the really important ideas in the *Epistle,* and refers to them rather condescendingly as "bewildering theoretical notions, as much intended to display his (Chatterton's) own deep reading as to refute his reverend friend's want of logic."

[1] C. E. Russell: *Thomas Chatterton,* pp. 127-129.

[2] J. H. Ingram: *The True Chatterton,* p. 149.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

While Chatterton was, of course, not at his time of life a deep or original philosopher, the *Epistle to Catcott* has, it seems to me, more significance than has been recognized, in the light it throws upon Chatterton's thinking.

The poem is a satire directed against Alexander Catcott's *Treatise on the Deluge.*[3] Catcott's book is a typical example of the numerous "theories of the earth" and explanations of the Deluge that appeared from time to time all through the century, the authors trying to invent some imaginary "system" by which the Mosaic account of Creation could be explained scientifically.[4] Chatterton's *Epistle,* according to a postscript which he appended to it, was meant as "an innocent effort of poetical vengeance, as Mr. Catcott has done me the honor to criticize my trifles," and Chatterton adds, "What I dislike in verse very possibly deserves my approbation in the plain prose of truth." Whatever the personal causes which produced the satire, however, it shows a point of view utterly different from that of Catcott and similar writers. Chatterton laughs at the attempt to explain the history of the earth according to the literal interpretation of Scripture, and describes how the explainer ends in trying to reconcile contradictions:

> Attentive search the Scriptures, and you'll find
> What vulgar errors are with truth combined.
> Your tortured truths, which Moses seemed to know,
> He could not unto inspiration owe;
> But if from God one error you admit,
> How dubious is the rest of Holy Writ!

He goes on to make numerous criticisms of Catcott's system, none very cogent, but all questioning how, according to natural law, such and such an event could have taken place:

> 'Twas the Eternal's fiat, you reply;
> And who will give Eternity the lie?
> I own the awful truth, that God made all,
> And by his fiat worlds and systems fall;
> But study nature; not an atom there
> Will unassisted by her powers appear.

[3] First published in 1761, revised in 1768.

[4] The earliest and best known of these "theories of the earth" was Thomas Burnet's *Telluris Theoria Sacra,* 1681. Others were written by: John Ray (1691, 1692), John Woodward (1695), William Whiston (1696), Benoît De Maillet (1749).

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

He then turns his fire against pantheism which fancies that God and nature are the same. The implication as to Chatterton's own ideas is plain. He believed neither in a "carpenter God" who set the world going and since then has remained aloof, nor in a God who works directly through continual miracles, nor yet in a God who is identical with nature, but in a God who is continuously working his will through the agency of natural laws and natural processes. And that conception of God is a conception far more usual today than it was in Chatterton's time.

Chatterton's "free-thinking," as he calls it, in regard to Scripture, has a good deal of boyish bravado in it. This fact is plain from the "Will" which he wrote in 1770:

"I leave the Reverend Mr. Catcott some little of my free-thinking, that he may put on spectacles of Reason, and see how vilely he is duped in believing the Scriptures literally."

Nevertheless, the *Epistle to Catcott* shows that Chatterton had good reasons behind his heterodoxy. The spirit which declared that the Scriptures could not fairly be interpreted literally, and that God works entirely through natural law, was far more than simply a manifestation of immature free-thinking. Chatterton was not, of course, alone in his time, or a pioneer in this spirit. He undoubtedly assimilated his opinions and arguments to a large extent from books; and he was taking up ideas which had been coming more and more persistently to the front as the eighteenth century progressed. But he utters his convictions with the virility and clarity that is characteristic of his young genius that "perished in its pride."

G. R. Potter.

Dartmouth College.

DANTE NOTES

IV. The Three Goddesses

In essa gerarcia son l'altre dee:
prima Dominazioni, e poi Virtudi;
l'ordine terzo di Podestadi èe. (*Par.*, XXVIII, 121 ff.)

I regret to notice that the Critical Text of the Società Dantesca Italiana has adopted the reading "*l'altre* dee" in this passage in-

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

stead of the familiar "*le tre* dee"—which, in spite of the almost universal and to my mind inexplicable puzzlement or reticence of commentators, is perfectly clear in meaning and natural in its relations to the context. So far as I know, Buti alone gave the obvious explanation: these three Angelic Orders in the hierarchy thus designated as *dee* are the only ones the names of which in Italian (and Latin) are of the feminine gender.

In *Conv.*, II, IV, 6, speaking of the Intelligences in general, Dante had said: "Li gentili le chiamano *Dei e Dee.*" And many analogous cases are found of the use, as metaphors, of feminine nouns which are consonant in gender with other feminines and are grammatically rather than logically appropriate. For example: in *Purg.*, XIX, 51, those who mourn are affirmed to be blessed, for "avran di consolar l'anime *donne*"—they shall have their souls "mistresses," that is, possessors, of consolation. Compare *Inf.*, XXV, 4, "Da indi in qua mi fuor le serpi *amiche*"; here it is hard to say whether *amiche* is noun, "friends" (f.), or adjective, "friendly" (*i. e.*, so felt by me)—or rather, there is no distinction between the two concepts. Further cases of unmistakable nouns so used are: *Purg.*, IV, 110-11, "più negligente / che se pigrizia fosse sua *serocchia*"; and Purg., XXI, 28, "l'anima sua, ch'è tua e mia *serocchia*"—where the soul is spoken of as "sister" merely because the gender of "anima" is feminine; and *Purg.*, XVI, 85-8, where the soul is compared to a girl ("fanciulla") for the same reason. *Vedova,* of *V. N.*, XXXI, is very likely intended as noun, in a metaphor.

Similarly, allegorical personifications of abstract qualities as male or female, according to the gender of the noun (*e. g.*, Amore as a "segnore," and Morte as "nemica" and "di dolore *madre* antica," in *V. N.*, VIII), are only conventionalized—and more consciously visualized—extensions of this type.

And indeed this usage is but a branch of that fundamental principle in so many languages, which leads, in only a very slightly diverging direction, to the employment of feminine pronouns to refer to feminine nouns; looked at in this light, the whole matter becomes so obvious as to render discussion superfluous.[1] The

[1] In *Par.*, XXII, 127, "inlei" may almost be said to be a feminine verb, being made of the feminine pronoun "lei" for the sole purpose of referring back to the feminine noun "salute" in line 124.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

continual necessity of dodging "she" and "her" in the rendering of these pronouns into English is one of the standard petty annoyances to translators of the *Divine Comedy,* where the word "anima" and the pronouns referring to it are necessarily rather frequent. "It" is at best an unsatisfactory makeshift.

The *apparatus criticus* to our new Accepted Text is very much of a desideratum. Scartazzini says [2] that "le tre" is the reading not only of the best MSS., but of all the old commentators up to Landino.

There is also a reading "l'alte," which gives sense. But "l'altre" has no sense nor fitness, in this context; and I am curious to know what led to its acceptance. If merely an application of the principle of *lectio difficilior,* it was certainly applied with a vengeance.

V. The Three Garments

The symbolic use of the three "theological colors"—if I may use this term—in Dante's descriptions of Beatrice is familiar to every reader of his works; but I wonder if any one of them, even among specialists, has noted that in the poet's three supreme visions of his Lady, two in this world and one in the next, she appears to him clad respectively in the red of Love, the white of Faith, and the green of Hope.

It was as a child in her ninth year that she first flashed upon his eyes and spirit, "vestita di nobilissimo colore, umile, e onesto, sanguigno" (*Vita Nuova,* II, 3); exactly nine years later (and in the ninth hour of the day) he first received her ineffable salutation as she walked between two gentlewomen, "vestita di colore bianchissimo" (*V. N.,* III, 1); and then on Wednesday, April 13th, A. D. 1300,[3] the penitent Pilgrim on the summit of Purgatory feels each drop of his blood quickened by the embers of the "ancient flame," as "*a* Lady" appears to him upon the triumphal Car of the Church, with a crown of olive over her snow-white ("candido") veil, and clad with the color of living flame under "*verde* manto" (*Purg.,* XXX, 31-3). All three colors are indeed represented in this last picture; but the mantle of green covers the red robe, and over the white veil is the green of olive.

[2] *Div. Comm. di D. A.,* III, Leipzig, 1882, p. 768.

[3] Moore, *Time References in the Divine Comedy,* Table VI.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

This is, therefore, both the third unit of the series and at the same time their summation.

Two other cases occur in the *Vita Nuova* in which Beatrice is described with blood-red garments; but they are both secondary, being in the relation of visions to real life: the first is allegorical (III, 4), and the second (XXIX, 1) reminiscent of the first actual meeting in childhood. The vision in the Terrestrial Paradise is in one sense also allegorical; but in the sequence of Dante's spiritual and esthetic experience it takes primary rank, and so it does necessarily in the minds and consciousness of us who read his record.[4]

Another fact in this connection which is perhaps not a mere coincidence may be worth attention. After we have observed the care which Dante takes to connect his and Beatrice's ninth year[5] with the first of these three—may I call them "avatars"?—and noted his explicit statement[6] that the second, when all in white she saluted him, came exactly nine years later, it is interesting to find that the third vision—that on the top of the Mountain of

[4] White, also, occurs twice more in the *Vita Nuova*, in secondary position: XXIII, 7, Dante sees her soul in a prophetic vision of her death as a "nebuletta bianchissima," borne upward by angels; and XXIII, 8, in a sequel to that same vision he seems to behold ladies covering her head "con uno bianco velo." Moore, in *Dante Studies*, III series (1903), p. 187, notes that in the *V. N.* Beatrice is "never associated with green," and attributes this to the "disappointed and even despairing tone" of the whole work. I suspect it rather of being another bit of evidence that the prose of the *V. N.* was planned to form an integral part of the whole Cycle of Beatrice and his own spiritual progress, whereof the first member comprised the lyrics written before the ambitious design had taken shape in his mind, and the last the great epic climax, and summation of the trilogy—itself tripartite. For note, first, that in no case is the color mentioned in the lyric passages of the *V. N.* corresponding to those in prose which I am treating here; and secondly, that while we have found red and white mentioned three times each in the prose—with green entirely absent—in the third vision each of them is repeated once, but each time topped with green, and by adding the very significant reference to Beatrice's eyes as "emeralds" in *Purg.*, XXXI, 116, at the close of this same scene, we discover a not unexpected triad of greens. Further, note that in the prose of *V. N.*, XXIII, Dante makes a special point of saying that only Beatrice's head was covered with the white veil.

[5] *V. N.*, II, 1-2.

[6] *V. N.*, III, 1.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

Purgatory—occurs in the eighteenth year (counting Continental fashion) after the second. Perhaps it is mere accident. Dante's cult of numbers is certainly much less obtrusive in the *Divine Comedy* than in the *Vita Nuova;* maybe it is also less fervent.

In any case, without straining after non-existent correspondences and correlations, there seem to be accumulating evidences that Dante may have had the entire general plan of his *Comedy* pretty well outlined before he wrote one word of the prose commentary which linked his earlier lyrics into what he named the *Vita Nuova.*

VI. Mille Milia (*Par.*, XXVI, 78)

The first Commentary to the new Critical Text of the *Divine Comedy*[7] seeks to perpetuate the bathos of interpreting this phrase as "thousand *miles.*" The autocratic Scartazzini,[8] though he had unceremoniously pitched out a rather critical word from the immediate context ("Il DA è superfluo"), thereupon, with very uncharacteristic impartiality, suggested that the "reader choose" between "miles" and "thousands."

If it were indeed a mere matter of personal choice! Certainly hesitation is incomprehensible, unless we grant that taste and a sense of what constitutes poetic diction lack claim to consideration. Our two most famous English verse translations render "miles," but even Cary and Longfellow seem to have felt a need of bolstering up the feeble phrase, and say respectively "thousand miles *below*" and "a thousand miles *and more.*"

But it must not mean "miles"; consider the setting, and recognize the echo: Dante stands with Beatrice in the eighth or Starry Heaven; in answer to her eager upward gaze, the firmament has brightened till, like a skyful of stars, Dante beholds thousands ("migliaia," *Par.*, XXIII, 28) of lights, the innumerable hosts of the Church Triumphant. From them approach one by one Peter, James, and John, to examine Dante in the theological virtues. But looking too eagerly into the light of John, Dante is blinded; and in this condition he finished his answers on the sub-

[7] *La Commedia di Dante Alighieri nel testo critico della Società Dantesca Italiana,* esposta e commentata da Enrico Mestica, Firenze, 1921-2.

[8] *Div. Comm. di D. A.,* III, Leipzig, 1882, p. 706.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

ject of Love. As he became silent, "a most sweet song resounded through the heaven, and my Lady was saying with the others 'Holy, holy, holy!'"[9] and then, in order that he might behold the light of Adam, Beatrice restored his sight:

> . . . . de li occhi miei ogni quisquilia
> fugò Beatrice col raggio de' suoi,
> che rifulgea DA più di *mille milia.*

Can this be other than a, conscious or unconscious, reminiscence of the *millia millium* of Revelation V, 11: "And I beheld, and I heard the voice of many angels round about the throne and of the creatures and of the elders: and the number of them was *thousands of thousands?*"[10] This is sense, but it is also apt; and, best of all, it is poetry.

If we keep *da*—as I am glad to see that the Accepted Text does—the terzina means that every impediment to Dante's sight was "put to flight by Beatrice with her eye's ray, which was reflecting the effulgence that came *from* [the] more than a thousand thousands [of gleaming spirits round about]"—or, perhaps better: "which was reflecting back effulgent *from* the more than a thousand thousand eyes all about them"; eyes have been the constant theme in the preceding verses and sections, indeed once in each of the immediately preceding verses of this very terzina, and to understand "eyes" in this the final verse gives the group a satisfactory completeness and point which alone would be almost enough to turn the scale, *ceteris paribus.* The stars, and such heavenly lights as here are seen, are often referred to, in the *Divine Comedy,* especially in the *Paradiso,* as "eyes," or by words like *viste, vedute,* etc., which seem best understood as poetical equivalents for eyes.[11] The concept of Beatrice's eyes, or of those of the heavenly host, as mirrors by

[9] *Par.,* XXVI, 67-9.

[10] I have translated this from the Vulgate in which is lacking the (to us) familiar "ten thousand times ten thousand"—apparently suggested by Daniel, VII, 10 (though the Vulgate there has "decies millies *centena* millia," as against the English Authorized Version's "ten thousand times *ten* thousand"). The Vulgate text is (Apoc., V, 11): "Et vidi, et audivi vocem angelorum multorum in circuitu throni, et animalium, et seniorum: et erat numerus eorum millia millium."

[11] E. g., in *Par.,* II, 115 (*cf. ibid.,* 143-4); XXIII, 30; XXX, 9. *Cf.* in *V. N.,* XXIII, where the stars seemed to weep.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

which and from which divine sights were reflected into Dante's vision, or higher power infused whereby his vision was strengthened, is a standard motif throughout the *Paradiso;*[12] and it is closely related to the more general doctrine of reciprocal illumination among the Blessed;[13] and to the power possessed by them of reading others' thoughts in the Divine Mirror.[14]

The verb *rifulgere* (var.: *re-*) is found a total of four times in the *Divine Comedy;* in one of the three other cases[15] it must mean reflection; in *Par.,* XXVIII, 95, it probably does so; and in *Par.*, IX, 32, it may merely imply "gleaming."[16]

If *da* be omitted, the passage will mean simply that Beatrice's eyes (or the ray therefrom, to follow the Accepted Text *rifulgea* strictly; there is a variant, *rifulgean*) "were more refulgent than a thousand thousand," which is still poetic diction.

Milia in our passage is in rime, and therefore has never incurred the imputation of being a miscopied *miglia;* which has not, however, saved its reputation semantically. *Milia* occurs twice elsewhere in the *Divine Comedy,* once in rime (*Inf.*, XXVI, 112), once within the verse (*Par.,* XXX, 1); both times *milia* means "thousands." *Miglia* occurs five times (*Inf.*, XXIX, 9; XXX, 86; *Purg.,* XIV, 18; *Par.,* XIX, 80; XXX, 1); each time it means "miles."

It is hardly necessary to enlarge on the material arguments against "miles," even if we could imagine that prosaic anticlimax to be a possibility worthy of dispassionate consideration. With *da* the passage would imply that Beatrice was more than a thou-

[12] *E. g., Par.*, I, 49; 64-9; XVIII, 55-69; XXVII, 97-9; there is a perfect example also in *Purg.*, XXXI, 118-26; and most apposite of all are *Par.*, XVII, 17-8 and XXVIII, 4-12. See the third article of this series, in *M. L. N.*, XXXVIII, 140-8.

[13] *V.*, esp., *Purg.*, XV, 67-75; *Par.*, XXII, 23-4.

[14] *V. Par.*, XI, 19-21, XV, 61-3, XXV, 103-8 (*cf. Par.*, IX, 61-2, in Note 15, *infra*).

[15] *Par.*, IX, 61-2: "Su sono *specchi*, voi dicete Troni,/ onde *refulge* a noi Dio giudicante."

[16] A thoughtful comparison of *Par.*, XXIII, 79-84, which describes the myriads of heavenly lights early in this same scene of the *Comedy*, will show an analogous concept of reflection; and the words *fulgorate* and *fulgori* in successive lines (83 and 84) will prove striking in this connection.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

sand miles away from Dante; without *da* it would leave us puzzled as to the direction and objective of such a wayward ray, and disappoint our sense of proportion by emphasizing a paltry dimension, sensibly less than a semi-radius of the Earth as Dante evaluated it, in a cosmic setting the traversed and anticipated distances of which are of interstellar magnitude.

HERBERT D. AUSTIN.

University of Southern California.

THE APPARITIONS IN *MACBETH*

PART I

There has been very general acceptance by later editors and critics of Upton's interpretations of the Apparitions that came to Macbeth in his second consultation with the witches at the beginning of the fourth act of the play. Furness quotes from Upton's first edition, 1746, and the same comment appears in the second edition as a footnote to page 39. The note reads as follows: "The armed head represents symbolically Macbeth's head cut off and brought to Malcolm by Macduff. The bloody child is Macduff untimely ripp'd from his mother's womb. The child with a crown on his head, and a bough in his hand, is the royal Malcolm; who ordered his soldiers to hew them down a bough, and bear it before them to Dunsinane." (Upton, *Critical Observations on Shakespeare,* 2nd ed., 1748.)

Furness apparently accepts Upton's interpretations as unquestionable, and in this is followed by a long line of editors and critics, including the Clarendon editors, Rolfe, Herford, Verity, Snider, Corson, Schelling, Chambers, Grierson, and all recent editors accessible to me. Only one, Mull (London, 1889), whom Furness also quotes, has a different opinion, and thinks that the "armed head" is intended to prefigure the warlike Siward, and the "bloody child" the son of Macduff slain by Macbeth. There seems, however, no ground for this interpretation, and, so far as I can discover, no one else adopts it.

There is certainly every reason for believing with Upton that

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

these apparitions are "symbolical representations of what shall happen to" Macbeth. The second and third apparitions are interpreted in this manner in the later developments of the play, and Upton's comments have been rightly accepted by later critics. But his interpretation of the first apparition, the "armed head" is entirely conjectural, and when carefully studied appears quite unsatisfactory. As Shakespeare found a hint for this in Holinshed, a study of the play and the sources may help us to understand this apparition. Then we shall be ready to understand also the fourth apparition, the full significance of which no one has seemed to recognize.

In order, however, to reach the true interpretation of the first apparition, it is desirable to consider the second and third which are in no way matters of dispute. If we can discover the principle of the symbolism involved in the second and third we may have a clue to the true meaning of the first, the "armed head." Then we shall be in a position to examine the fourth, the "show of eight kings," and will hope to find its deep significance.

For the second and third apparitions Shakespeare got the hints directly from Holinshed, but transformed what there are merely prophecies of "a certeine witch" into the apparitions or shows of the play. The "bloody child" of the second apparition, as editors believe, following Upton, is surely Macduff, and not the son of Macduff slain by Macbeth, as Mull alone suggests. In Holinshed this prophecy clearly enough refers to Macduff. And the play itself later connects it directly with Macduff, and it was so recognized by Macbeth. When Macbeth scorned Macduff's prowess by hurling defiantly at him the words of the apparition, Macduff disclosed himself as the fulfilment of the prophecy by retorting that "Macduff was from his mother's womb Untimely ripp'd" (V, VIII, 15-16).

The third apparition, the "Child crowned, with a tree in his hand," as Upton properly says, seems to point clearly to Malcolm, the son and heir of Duncan. The play itself later makes Malcolm the direct fulfilment of this prophecy when he ordered his soldiers to hew them down boughs and bear them before them (V, IV.). Macbeth recognized this as Birnam wood coming to Dunsinane, and as the fulfilment of the third apparition (V, V.).

We may now examine the first apparition of the "armed head,"

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

which is of doubtful interpretation. This should be considered first in the light of Holinshed, and then in relation to the other apparitions.

When we turn to Holinshed we find no difficulty. There we see that, as with the other two, Shakespeare has taken what was only a warning prophecy, and has transformed it also into an apparition. Holinshed made the prophecy refer directly to Macduff. He said: "Neither could he [Macbeth] afterwards abide to looke upon the said Makduffe, either for that he thought his puissance over great; either else for that he had learned of certeine wizzards, in whose words he put great confidence . . . . how that he ought to take heed of Makduffe, who in time to come should seeke to distroie him."

The question remains, then, whether Shakespeare followed his source closely, and made the warning only refer to Macduff, while making the apparition refer to Macbeth, or, whether he made both warning and apparition refer alike to Macduff. It seems simpler to make both refer to Macduff. And the analogy of the second and third apparitions would lead to the belief that the "armed head" represents Macduff, and not Macbeth, as Upton has misled the editors and critics in believing.

The second and third apparitions exhibited to Macbeth something in the future that he had every reason to fear. They pointed to those who were known to be his greatest enemies, and to developments of events he most dreaded. Malcolm and Macduff, together with Banquo, were the very persons that he most feared of all in the kingdom, and for the reason that they were all alike direct threats at his crown and his succession. It was Macbeth's ambition, as we shall see later, not only to gain the crown for himself, but also to pass it on to his descendants. His fears, then, were not more for his life than for his crown.

The second and third apparitions, as later seen, offered Macbeth deceitful advice and exhortation, and by mocking and riddling prophecy induced in him a false sense of security that put him off his guard, thereby making the impending catastrophe more certain. At the last, when confronted by Macduff, he recognized this truth and exclaimed:

> Accursed be that tongue that tells me so,
> For it hath cow'd my better part of man!

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

> And be these juggling fiends no more believed,
> That palter with us in a double sense;
> That keep the word of promise to our ear,
> And break it to our hope.

As the second and third, then, were both prophetic threats against his crown, quite as much as at his life, we may take it as probable that the first also was levelled at his greatest interest, his crown, and that it showed him what he had most to fear. All three alike were elaborated into apparitions from what the dramatist found as mere recorded prophecies in Holinshed, where they all appeared as of the same general character. It is probable, then, that the symbolism of the first is analogous to that of the second and third, and that the "armed head" represented Macbeth's great enemy, Macduff.

The sole warrant that either Upton or later editors find in the play for the view that the "armed head" was that of Macbeth himself is the stage direction near the end of the last act, "Re-enter Macduff, with Macbeth's head" (V, VIII, 53). Herford, Snider, and others follow Upton in saying that it was to this event that the apparition pointed, and that the "armed head" of the apparition, therefore, represented Macbeth's head severed from his body. This, however, is pure assumption, for which there is not one jot of evidence in the play. There is no evidence whatever in the play that the apparition represented a dismembered head at all. If it were Macbeth's head, cut off by Macduff, how could it be "armed"? But, if the apparition be taken as referring to this event, then it must represent Macduff's head, not, however, cut off from the body, but belonging to a body not seen.

This theory that the "armed head" represented the head of Macbeth "cut off" from the body creates, likewise, a grave difficulty in stage-craft. *Macbeth*, as a stage play, was somehow presented on the Elizabethan stage. The stage directions of the First Folio for this apparition simply say that "He Descends." The obvious inference is that the apparition descended through the trap-door in the stage, and that it was through this trap-door that it appeared. This, as every one familiar with the Elizabethan theatre will recognize, would involve no difficulties for the "armed head" of the living Macduff.

But how could this apparition be staged, if it be taken to repre-

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

sent the "armed head" of Macbeth, cut off from the body? How could a head "cut off" be made to rise and descend through the trap-door? If the part were taken by one of the actors, how could the head be made to appear "cut off"? And, if an actor were to appear on the stage with the semblance of Macbeth's head "cut off," as Macduff later appeared, how could the stage directions be followed, "He Descends"? Taking these considerations together, then, it seems impossible to regard the first apparition as representing Macbeth at all.

As already intimated, the conclusion is that the "armed head" of the first apparition must be taken to represent Macduff. The second and third apparitions, as is agreed, showed Macbeth's enemies, those whom he feared, and those most likely to thwart him in his great ambition to retain the crown and to pass it on to his descendants. In the same way, the fourth apparition showed the descendants of Banquo, followed by Banquo himself, another of his enemies, and the one he had already admitted he feared more than any other. If the first apparition, then, is to be interpreted consistently with the others, it must be taken as a forewarning and a prophecy of some one who would later deprive Macbeth of both his life and his crown. And this rôle was taken by no one but Macduff.

Upton's view, moreover, that the first apparition represented the head of Macbeth makes it a threat, not at Macbeth's ambition, but at his life, and this not by presenting some one he had reason to fear, as the other apparitions did, but only by a representation of himself in death. It was not death, however, that Macbeth feared most, but the loss of the kingship, and the thwarting of his great ambition to found a line of kings. It was not merely his death that was being worked out in the play, but the tragedy of his defeat. It was kingly ambition rather than mere life that was his ruling passion, and for which he had done all his accursed deeds of blood. Macbeth, like Othello, was a brave soldier and a mighty general and was not to be frightened by death staring him in the face. As he admitted to Lady Macbeth after the Banquet, he was afraid of the ghost, or, as he thought it, the dead body of Banquo, but he would fearlessly meet the living Banquo in the desert with his sword (III, IV, 100-106).

To keep an analogy with the other apparitions, then, the "armed

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

head" of the first apparition should symbolize some enemy who constituted a threat not so much at Macbeth's life as at his crown. The second showed him Macduff who was to lead the insurrection against his rule. The third warned him against Malcolm, the son and heir of Duncan, who, it was prophesied, would yet be king. These both challenged his hold on the throne. The first, then, should be understood to challenge Macbeth's kingship. The words of the text itself, spoken by the apparition, bade him "beware Macduff," and seemed to indicate that the "armed head" represented no other than Macduff, his great enemy, armed and equipped for battle, as the leader of the rebel forces that were to deprive him of his crown.

It seems reasonable to conclude, then, that the apparition of the "armed head" represented Macduff, as the warning words had referred directly to him. It was Macduff who was Macbeth's chief antagonist in the play, as in Holinshed, and, as he said himself, once Banquo was gone, the one he has most reason to fear,—"Of all men else I have avoided thee" (V, VIII, 4). As the chief antagonist of Macbeth, it was very appropriate that both the first and second apparitions in the play should point symbolically to Macduff. And this is very probable, since both the first and second prophetic warnings in Holinshed referred directly to Macduff.

A. W. CRAWFORD.

University of Manitoba.

REVIEWS

Etymologisches Wörterbuch der deutschen Sprache von FRIEDRICH KLUGE. Zehnte, verbesserte und vermehrte Auflage. Berlin und Leipzig, 1924, Walter de Gruyter & Co. xvi + 519 pp. Bound, M. 15.

That a new edition of the *Wörterbuch* became necessary within three years after the appearance of its predecessor gives ample testimony concerning the usefulness of this standard work of reference. It was hardly to be expected that many new etymologies should be recorded in this brief interval, and the forty additional pages which the new edition contains have been largely devoted

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

to the history of recent additions to the language, words whose earliest meaning and date of appearance it seemed desirable to record. This, of course, makes the book more useful and attractive also to the general reader. The nature of these additions may be gathered from the following examples, taken from the first letter of the alphabet:

Abfütterung, Abhülfe, ablang, Abort, All, Allmacht, Allvater, Almrausch, Angebinde, annektieren, antediluvianisch, antik, Antlasstag, Apfelschimmel, Aprilnarr, Argusaugen, Ariadnefaden, Aristokratie, aromatisch, Ästhetik, ätsch, Attacke, Augendiener, Augenweide, Augiasstall, Ausstand.

A number of the new entries had already been made accessible to readers of *MLN.* in articles contributed by Professor Kluge to the numbers of January and May, 1923. The following supplementary material is submitted in the hope that it may be found useful in the preparation of the next edition:

ALLVATER, cited from Klopstock, to whom the word is generally attributed, appears as early as 1749 in Gottsched's *Neuer Büchersaal* (VIII, 85): Odin heisst Allvater. Cf. Reichel's *Gottsched-Wörterbuch,* I, 136.

ARREST: much earlier than the noun, which Kluge dates from the 16th century, is the verb *arrestieren:* die hot der bobist arrestiret (*Script. Siles.* VI, 117: 1432). The noun first occurs in the form *arristirung:* bey verhefftung und arristirung jrs leibs und guts (*Fontes rerum austr.* 44, 143: 1461). The verb is very frequent in Low German documents of the 14th and 15th centuries, usually in the form *rosteren,* but also as *arresteren,* both cited by Schiller-Lübben. The noun appears as *rosteringe, rostemente* (*Lüb. Urkbch.* VI, 439) and *arrastament* (*ib.* VII, 17).

BLINDEKUH is recorded as early as 1734 by Steinbach: die blinde Kuh spielen, *velatis oculis alios capere* (I, 133). Gottsched uses the word in 1741 as the name of a card game (Reichel, *Gottsched-Wbch.,* I, 857).

FIXSTERN: the synonym *Haftstern* does not seem to be known to lexicographers: sowol die Hafft- als Irrsterne (Stubenberg,[1] p.

[1] *Von menschlicher Vollkommenheit . . . Samt den Lehr-Arten der Wissenschaften . . . in Frantzösischer Zungen beschrieben, anietzt aber aus*

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

277); die Haftsterne (pp. 458, 464); eines aus den Haftgestirnen (p. 491).

FLITZBOGEN: Kluge states that the form *Flitschbogen* (from *Flitsch,* 'arrow') predominates in the 16th and 17th centuries. The earliest instance, however, which is not recorded in the dictionaries, is spelled *flitzbogen:* nach dem etliche jre flitzbogen gebrauchet (Eppend. Türck.[2] p. 14). In his *Kriegsübung*[3] (1551) the same author uses the word *flitzbogener,* likewise unknown to lexicographers: dem fusz volck zu hilff, die mit den flitzbogenern, handlen sollten (fol. 95[b]). *Flitter,* 'arrow,' seems likewise to have escaped notice: Pasqualin Patron der Marchesen ist mit einer flittern in hals verwundt, Scheurl,[4] fol. b.

GLAST: as this word, cited from Goethe, seems to be rare in NHG., the following instances may be of interest: die statt, so sich durch ein langen frid, widerumb anfieng zů erquicken, vnd zům teyl den alten glast vnd zyerd an sich zůnemen (Eppend. *Gal.*[5] p. 128). Similarly in the *Kriegsübung,*[3] fol. 22[b]:

> So warden auch mit fewres glast
> Cometen, ...

The figurative sense occurs also in Stubenberg (1660): Unter den Bücheren, . . . ist fast keines, so man mit grösserem Glaste hat wollen scheinen lassen (p. 586).

GLASUR, cited from Stieler (1691), goes back to Stubenberg:

selbiger in unsere hochteutsche Mutter-Haubt-Sprache übersetzt durch ein Mitglied der hochlöblichen Fruchtbr. Gesellschaft Den Unglückseligen. Nürnberg bey Michael Endter 1660. This rare book (17 unnumb. leaves, 767 pp., 16 unnumb. leaves) is not recorded by Goedeke (III, 247, 14). The translator's name: Johann Wilhelm, Herr von Stubenberg, appears at the close of the *Zuschrift.* As we shall see, many words usually cited from Stieler (1691) appear a generation earlier in this work of Stubenberg. It was, of course, very natural that Stieler should record the vocabulary of his fellow-member in the *Fruchtbringende Gesellschaft.*

[2] *Türckischer Keyszer Ankunfft . . . verdolmetscht durch Heinrich von Eppendorff,* Strassburg, 1540.

[3] *Kriegsübung dess . . . Kaisers Julij,* Strassburg, 1551.

[4] *Verteutschte verrüffung des Anstandts in Picardien.* At the end: *Cchri. Schcurl Doct. vij. Septemb. 1537.*

[5] *Römischer Historien . . . Anhangk . . . vom Galeatio Capella beschriben. Durch Henrich von Eppendorff.* Strassburg, 1536.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

ein neues Geschirrwerk von allerhand Farben und Glasuren zu zurichten (p. 477).

HUSAR may be cited in the following early instances: haben in die Hussarn nach geeylt vnnd die ringen phert jnnen fill volkhs erlegt (Schertlin,[6] p. 25: 1532); so sollen die Hussarn, alls her Hanns Catzianner . . . haben 3000 ringe phert (p. 27). bei sich hette ehr vier hundert hussern, das sein kriegesleute auf die Turksche manier (Grunau,[7] III, 271: event of 1529)

JUNGGESELLE occurs as early as the 15th century: ein Jung gesell, Nempt sich Sebold Ridler von Nüremberg (Ochsenbein,[8] p. 56); einen Jungengesellen (p. 274).

KANNEGIESSER, 'Bierbankpolitiker,' is universally traced back to Holberg's comedy (1722), which was translated into German in 1742. As a term of reproach, the word may be cited, however, as early as the 15th century: Olsze rugt, das Mate Scheffer vor die gemeyne bracht hat, das yn Mats Behmer eyn kannengisser geheyssen hat (Boetticher,[9] p. 222: 1499).

KOMET: Stubenberg replaces the word by *Besenstern* and *Schwanzstern:* von der Besensterne Schwantze, und von allen Luft-Erscheinungen (p. 301); allerhand Feuer-Gestalten, samt den Schwantzsternen (p. 379); die Schwantzsterne seyen keine entzündete Luft-Erscheinungen (p. 480).

KOMMISSBROT: Kluge assumes that the first member of the compound is an abbreviation of *Kommission.* This is borne out by the following: usz krafft siner commisz vnd gewaltes (Schilling,[10] p. 173: ca. 1500).

LEUTSELIG is quoted by Kluge, as well as other lexicographers, solely in the sense of 'freundlich.' Krämer [11] (p. 117), however,

[6] *Seb. Schertlin von Burtenbach und seine an die Stadt Augsburg geschriebenen Briefe,* von Th. Herberger, Augsburg, 1852.

[7] *Simon Grunau's Preussische Chronik,* hrsg. v. P. Wagner, Leipzig, 1876-1896.

[8] *Die Urkunden der Belagerung und Schlacht von Murten,* Freiburg, 1876.

[9] *Die Rügengerichte in Görlitz und in Löbau (Neues Lausitzisches Magazin,* Bd. 73).

[10] *Diebold Schilling's, des Lucerners, Schweizer Chronik,* Lucern, 1862.

[11] *Teutsch- und Italiänische Gespräche . . . verfasset Von M. J. Parival, . . . übersetzet Von Matthia Krämern, . . . Nürnberg,* 1691.
Also in Krämer's *Dictionarium* (Nürnberg. 1676), *popolato* is defined as *bevolcket, volckreich, leutselig.*

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

gives it as an alternative to *volkreich:* Sono ben popolate, Sind sie volckreich (leutselig?). There can be no doubt as to the meaning attributed to the word by Krämer.

LUFTSCHLOSS, 'Phantasiegebilde,' cited from Stieler (1691) and Mylius (1777), is used by Stubenberg (1660): demnach viel tapfere Leute den Stein der Weisen für ein Luft-Schloss halten (p. 483).

MÖRSER: an otherwise unrecorded form Mörsner, of the year 1684, is quoted *MLN.* XXXVIII, 404.

NEBENBUHLER: for this Stubenberg uses the synonym *Nebenstecher:* so beraubt sie doch der Neid ihrer Nebenstechere ihrer billichen Ehre (p. 18). Steinbach (1734) records: Mitbuhler, *rivalis, corrivalis* (I, 217).

PEKESCHE: early instances of the word are: Wir fanden beym Eingang des Hauses die Braut in einer schönen Pikesche *Couleur de Puce,* mit rosenfarbnen Taft gefüttert, und auf der Brust und in der Taille mit den reichsten silbernen Drotteln besetzt (*Teutscher Merkur,* 1779, IV, 194). die grossen Schritte, die sie noch aus ihrem alten Stande zu thun gewohnt war, passten mit nichten zu der zierlichen Pikesche mit den silbernen Drotteln (p. 200).

PFUSCHEN: lexicographers first cite this word, asigned to East Middle Germany, from the year 1586, in the form *verpfuschen.* The following forms, even though their identity may not be entirely certain, claim attention on account of their greater age: das sie is andirswo vorpusschet hetten und vorburget (*Monum.*[12] VI, 435:1418). It may be added that *vorburget* stands for *vorburgen,* which spelling occurs on p. 438. Eyn teyl was be seyte geleget, sunder is muste hervor. Die besten rinck mit den edelsten gesteynen seynt vorposchet, dach wil ich dornoch stellen (Bunge,[13] X, 469: 5. Jul. 1449). As this scribe confuses *a* and *o* (*dach* = *doch, kastliche* = *kostliche*), *vorposchet* may possibly stand for *verpaschet* (cf. *DWB.* XII, 958: 'schmuggelnd verkaufen'). ist ein verborgen gemach gewest, dorjnnen tzwene gen eynander in der mawern haben sitzen mogen, vnd in die stube vorpfost, das jsz vnmerglich gewest ist (*Script. rerum Lusat.* III, 350, event of

[12] *Monumenta . . . res gestas Poloniae illustrantia,* Cracovie, 1874 ff.
[13] *Liv- Est-, und Curländisches Urkbch.,* Reval, 1853 ff.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

1514). The idea of secrecy, which Walther (*Zs. d. Wortf.* VIII, 195) considers inherent in *pfuschen,* is present in all the words just cited, and the texts are all Middle German of the eastern borders, but connection with *Busch,* which Walther posits, does not seem by any means established.

PLUDERHOSE: in addition to the variant *Bloderhose,* cited by Kluge, there is a form *Fluderhose:* mit sammten wambes vnd scharneckle vnd schwartzen fluderhoszen mit daffet gefuetret mit silbern deggenketten, die Spanier sament Wambes vnd ledern koller auch schwartz fluder hoszen wie ob gefuetret (Unterfr.[14] 47, 316 f.).

PROVIANT: instead of 1551, this word can be cited as early as 1474: ander volcks, das mit prowanden ab und ane kumpt (*Fontes rer. austr.* 46, 317: 1474). vnd ist grosz cost von korn vnd von fleisch vnd von ander breuiande dorjnne gewesen (Ochsenbein[8], p. 59: 1476).

SCHRIFTSTELLER: in its present meaning of 'author' the word is said to date from Gottsched's time. The following earlier instances are from Stubenberg (1660): Es gibt viel Schrifftstellere, die unter dem Namen der Naturkundigung nur fünf oder sechs Theilungen herfürgeben (p. 224). Theils Schrifftsteller sagen Wunder und Mäher von alten Gemählden, wie es dann deren in der That treffliche gehabt (p. 303). Stubenberg uses also *Schrifft-Verfasser* (pp. 194, 195, 205) and *Schrifften-Verfasser* (pp. 193, 216).

SELBSTLAUTER, 'Vokal,' is cited from Stieler (1691). Here again Stubenberg has an earlier form: . . . Lettern nennet; diese sind in Selbstlautend- oder Mitstimmere abgetheilet (p. 208). *Mitstimmer,* 'Konsonant,' does not seem to be known to lexicographers.

STÄNDCHEN: for this Stubenberg has the synonym *Abendständerling:* seiner Buhlschaft einen Abendständerling hielte (p. 292).

STOFF, cited from Stieler (1691), likewise goes back to Stubenberg, who uses it very frequently: haben Stoffes gnug, p. 279); von denen, die an einigem Stoffe arbeiten (p. 284); wann man über den Stöffen arbeitet (p. 313); dieser Stöffe Geschlechte zu finden (p.

[14] *Archiv des historischen Vereins von Unterfranken und Aschaffenburg.*

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

314). The plural regularly has umlaut. The adjective *stoffbar* occurs on pp. 67, 274, 393, *unstoffbar* on p. 276.

STRAPAZE is cited from Stieler (1691). An earlier form *Strabat,* 'Niederlage,' occurs in Eppend. *Röm.:*[15] derhalb die Römer . . . von dem erdychten Künig ein wüste strabat entpfyengen (p. 24).

TONKÜNSTLER: this word, cited from Stieler (1691), again goes back to Stubenberg: indeme er sich eines Ton-Künstlers zum Werkzeuge gebraucht (p. 295). *Ton-Kunst* (pp. 288 ff.), *Tonkunst-Lehrsatz* (p. 222), *Tonlautung* (p. 289), *Tonspiel* (p. 104), *Tonwerkzeug* (pp. 47, 552), and *Ton-Zeichen* (p. 292) also occur.

TORTE is recorded for the early 16th century. A Latin document dated 1418 proves that the word must have been known a century earlier: vnam pasteydam et vnam tortam sicut (in) nupciis sunt (*Lüb. Urkbch.*, VI, 88). *Pasteydam,* of course, is a latinized *Pastete.*

UNBILL: in addition to the feminine *Unbill,* whose literary use is dated 1760, we may cite from Stubenberg (1660) a masculine or neuter form of the word: wegen des von selbigen empfangenen Unbillens (p. 59); uns gegen die Unbillen der Zeit . . . zu schirmen (p. 306).

UNSTERN occurs very frequently in Stubenberg: Man soll solchen Unstern nicht verhehlen (p. 58); dass sie diese Unsterne überwinden noch erschrecken können (p. 86); haben diese Lehr-Künste keinen anderen Unstern auf sich (p. 223).

WEIBSBILD, cited from Stieler (1691), also goes back to Stubenberg: blosz nachforschen, wo es die schönsten Weibsbilder . . . gibet (p. 767).

WEINFALTER, first cited from the year 1723, occurs abundantly in Stubenberg: vieles Ungeziefers, insonderheit der Raupen und Weinfalteren (p. 696); was vor Raupen und Weinfalteren (oder Molkendiebe) aus theils Gewächsen kommen (*ib.*); sich die Raupen in ein Gespühle einschliessen, und wann sie Weinfalteren werden (p. 697); fast aller Weinfalteren, derer Buntigkeit dieses

[15] *Römischer Historien Bekürtzung . . . Durch Heinrich von Eppendorff.* Strassburg, 1536.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

Ungeziefers Schönheit sehen lässt (*ib.*); was vor eine Weinfalter-Gestalt sie habe (*ib.*);

WÜTERICH: a similar formation, apparently unrecorded, is *mietrich:* daz er mietrich were (Justinger,[16] p. 114: ca. 1420). On p. 123 in different wording: daz er miet solte han genomen (*i. e.,* that he had been bribed).

ZOTTELN: in addition to the MHG. *zoten,* a 15th century form *zodeln* may be noted: kein sewmnus sein . . . dann sich krigszleuft nicht zodeln wollen lassen (*Fontes rer. austr.* 44, 195: 1464).

W. KURRELMEYER.

Linguistique et Dialectologie romanes; Problèmes et Méthodes Par G. MILLARDET. Montpellier et Paris: Champion, 1923. 520 pp. 8° (Publications de la Société des langues romanes, t. XXVIII).

We have in this work of Georges Millardet a fairly complete exposition and criticism of the various methods used in linguistic and dialectal studies, and no one is better qualified than the author of *Etudes de Dialectologie Landaise* to undertake the task. The book is full of ideas and facts and one can even find in it some wholesome truths that are liable to be forgotten by a certain school of philologists. The book is attractively, and, one may say, wittily written and every student of linguistics will read it with pleasure and profit.

The work is divided into three parts of five chapters each. In the first part, entitled *Aperçu général,* the author gives a comprehensive survey of the whole field of linguistics. He reviews every important subject from the use of experimental phonetics to problems of toponomy. He shows the relative value of literary compositions and legal documents, and passes to the utility of experimental phonetics and to the geographical method. Here we have a critical appreciation of the *Atlas linguistique* of Gilliéron and Edmont. He points out the short-comings of such a work, giving at the same time his idea of a perfect atlas. He criticises very sharply those Romance scholars who refuse absolutely to go back to the "roman commun"

[16] *Berner Chronik von Conrad Justinger,* Bern, 1870.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

and who want to isolate their method from the comparative method that has given such good results in the study of Indo-European languages.

He goes on to prove that, in spite of their contempt for the comparative method, this school really resorts to it without admitting it, as for example, when the "*géographe*" speaks of the "*suffixe qui correspond au français -ier.*" Supporting Meillet's dictum "*qui veut vraiment expliquer n'a pas plus le droit d'isoler les périodes modernes des périodes anciennes que l'on n'a le droit d'expliquer l'état actuel en négligeant le passé,*" G. Millardet urges the Romance student not only to go back to the Latin but even beyond. He would also like to see an atlas of all Romania, for one cannot isolate the Romance dialects according to political boundaries, since everything in the domain of Romance philology is related to something else; and, moreover, one must not neglect the literary and official languages, in spite of the fact that Gilliéron calls them "*langues stagnantes*"; for these "*langues prétendues stagnantes sont bien vivantes puisqu'elles combattent et puisqu'elles vainquent.*" He permits the use of dialectology, but holds that it should be subordinate to the study of the literary language and not be an end in itself, for, after all, as Gilliéron himself admits, literary French is "*le Musée national.*" This is important, coming from the author of *Etudes de Dialectologie Landaise.* He even quotes M. Grammont on the refinement of civilized languages (*R. L. R.* LX, 438).

The end of the first part is an excellent refutation of the claim put forward by the "*géographes*" *that* "*la phonétique brutale fait à la psychologie souple et complexe une place de plus en plus importante.*" G. Millardet maintains that phonetics is the fundamental base on which is built the whole edifice of language. Phonetics can explain a problem of toponomy or solve a question of semantics. Morphology also is immediately dependent on phonetics and the action of phonetic laws can bring about modifications and even complete changes in the inflexional system. Even loss of flexions due to phonetic change is compensated by a new system created by phonetic change. It would seem that syntax would be free from its influence, yet here again we see it at work. G. Millardet quotes Foulet on "*C'est moi*" and Meillet on the disappearance of the past definite as showing the effect of phonetics on syntax.

The second part of the book is entirely devoted to phonetics. In

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

it Millardet discusses many problems of great interest. He begins by devoting considerable space to refuting Gilliéron, whose "*Mirages phonétiques*" are mercilessly treated. He points out all the weak points in that work and gives his own solution of the problems discussed, based, of course, on phonetics and the comparative method. Nevertheless, he recognizes that geographical linguistics can be of very great help and, in the chapter on convergence of methods, Millardet shows how a combination of the two methods is indispensable for the correct solution of certain problems. Taking what would seem an opposite point of view, he deals with the palatals in Piedmontese as treated by Attilio Levi and shows conclusively how geographical linguistics prove the Italian scholar's deductions. In every branch the combination of methods is necessary, even to distinguish loan words of the native elements. He stresses specially the principles of "*superposition*" and "*configuration des aires.*" In those two chapters, the student will find many interesting problems which cannot be detailed here, such as the discussion of *pièce, nièce, avoine,* the value of K+e, i in Romance; the evolution of the classical latin group *gn.* In the treatment of this last problem Millardet goes beyond Classical Latin to the primitive form and shows how it is often necessary to go beyond the historical period of Latin in treating Latin phonetics.

He next takes up the question of phonetic laws, bringing out the difference between laws and tendencies. "Every law is the expression of a tendency but a tendency does not necessarily become a law." The latter is the expression of a constant relation, of a necessary concordance, between two states of the same language at different chronological stages. This he uses to show how dissimilation and differentiation obey certain tendencies and are not chance happenings.

The second part ends with a chapter entitled "Lois aveugles," one of the most important of the book, if not the most important. It is a combative chapter full of fighting spirit, where the author uses all his *verve* to vindicate the old phonetic methods, even going so far as to bring to a fixed principle a number of phonetic phenomena. He introduces a theory of syllabic norms based on F. de Saussure's definition of a syllable; "*Une unité constituée par un ou plusieurs phonèmes ouvrants* (*ou explosifs*) *rangés par aperture croissante et suivis d'un ou plusieurs phonèmes fermants* (*ou*

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

implosifs) rangés par aperture décroissante. He throws new light on some obscure problems such as the treatment of *f* in Gascon and the reduction of the diphthong in Spanish. He even applies it to the discussion of the French *oi* and also to the displacement of accent. The whole chapter is full of interesting matter expressed in vivid and even picturesque language.

In the third part, G. Millardet treats of problems other than phonetic. He would like to see a semasiological atlas as well as Gilliéron's onomasiological atlas. Had that atlas existed, Gilliéron's error in the etymology of *pervenche* would not have been made. He also tackles the problem of homonymy, so dear to M. Gilliéron, and of popular etymology. He again wittily contradicts many of Gilliéron's deductions; *briulete* (violet), says Gilliéron, is not *violette* but derived from *abriu* (april); G. Millardet cannot understand how a flower could take its name from a month in which it never appears, at least in that part of the country. Gilliéron would say the same thing, too, about *briuloun* (violin)! Here again Millardet shows that phonetic and popular etymology are but two aspects of the same problem.

In morphology also can be seen the effect of phonetics. The same tendencies that influence phonetics influence morphology. He illustrates his arguments by many examples of high interest. In the chapter on syntax, he strikes the same note. We must resort to Latin in order to understand the problem of syntax. Although the book was written before Brunot's *La Pensée et la Langue* had appeared, he adds an appreciation and a criticism of that book in a note. He maintains his opinion, founded on the articles of Brunot in *La Revue Universitaire,* doubting "*qu'en faisant passer au second plan toute observation des phénomènes concrets du langage, on puisse arriver à en rendre compte scientifiquement.*" He finds that after all the book is not revolutionary, nothing is explained—everything is merely reclassified. He ends his work with a short chapter on the relation between linguistics and other sciences, such as literary history, discussion of sources, localisation of manuscripts, the question of substrata, movements of population, and the question of sociology.

Linguistique et Dialectologie Romanes has been said to be a criticism of Gilliéron. I should rather say it is an answer to the criticism of Gilliéron and his school, a parry with a thrust after it. His

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

criticisms are pointed and supported by close reasoning, strong arguments and excellent examples. His methods are scientific and rigorously accurate. One must not infer that Millardet is the averred opponent of the geographical method but he does oppose doing away with everything else and making that the only criterion. He warns us against what he calls "*la dialectologie filmée et catastrophique.*" His concluding lines,—"*La vérité linguistique, comme toute vérité scientifique ne sortira ni d'une recherche maladive ou enfantine de la nouveauté, ni d'un chambardement général des connaissances et des méthodes. Ici, plus qu' ailleurs peut-être, l'utopie, l'intuitionnisme et en même temps le vain étalage d'une fausse précision scientifique, voila les ennemis*"—will rally to his support all those who, like the reviewer, see some danger in the overthrowing of old methods which, although not perfect, still remain the surest.

I must add that the book contains instructive figures and two indices that greatly help in referring to any particular problem.

C. Gilli.

Bryn Mawr College.

Father Tabb: A Study of his Life and Works, with Uncollected and Unpublished Poems. By Francis A. Litz. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1923.

In his study of Father Tabb Dr. Litz has endeavored to do three things: to present afresh the facts of Tabb's life, to classify and appraise his poems, and to collect so far as possible his uncollected and unpublished writings. For the task undertaken Dr. Litz possessed exceptional advantages. He was for several years a pupil under Father Tabb at St. Charles' College, Maryland, and there came daily into personal contact with the poet, who at one time vouchsafed to give to him a brief account of his life. Besides, he has lived and taught in Baltimore, where he has enjoyed the acquaintance and the friendship of most of Tabb's closest friends.

The volume, so the author informs us, grew largely out of the brief autobiographical account committed to him by the poet shortly before his death. This, unhappily, covers only about ten years of the poet's life, but it includes the important period of the Civil War. For the rest Dr. Litz has had to rely mainly on his

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

own researches. The material available he has evidently sifted with the accuracy and the thoroughness of a scholar; though he is not entirely happy in the arrangement of his materials, and in shifting his point of view several times (see, especially, pp. 30 and 36) he has injured the coherence and, in a measure, the clarity of his account.[1] That there are periods in the life of Tabb that are still very obscure (as, for instance, the major part of the years 1870-1872, when the poet virtually drops out of sight), he freely admits; and despite his enthusiastic admiration for his former teacher, he admits that he exhibited at times something of vindictiveness in his relations with his colleagues at St. Charles', and that by reason of his sensitiveness and of sundry eccentricities, he was not always a companionable associate.

In his appreciation of Tabb's poems Dr. Litz naturally lays stress on the brevity and the epigrammatic nature of his verses, on his grace and finish and perfection of form, and on the preponderance of nature and religion as his themes. It is in his peculiar fusion of nature and religion,or rather, in his treatment of nature in terms of religion,—that Dr. Litz finds Father Tabb's chief distinction.[2] Tabb's taste, he justly observes, was not infrequently at fault: there is a strain of coarseness in a good many of his poems, and certainly he overworked the pun. At variance with one of the most astute of Tabb's critics, Dr. Litz holds that Tabb's verses do not lack in "singing quality." The poet's acquaintance with other poets was, he maintains, startlingly limited (see pp. 144-5). His chief literary indebtednesses were, he declares, to Shakespeare and Keats and Shelley and Tennyson and Lanier and Poe; and he adduces numerous parallels in support of this view; but I am not convinced that Tabb owed much to Poe, despite his warm admiration for that unhappy genius and his fine championing of his cause. An excellent section is that devoted to Tabb's habits of composition.

[1] There are other evidences of haste in the writing and in the printing of the volume, as in the inconsistency between the statistics given on pp. 108 and 110, and the tabular statement on p. 96. And the method adopted of throwing the footnotes to the end of the volume, although they are duly numbered in the body of the book, is quite exasperating.

[2] This point, in my judgment, Dr. Litz labors too far; nor does he make his meaning readily clear. See for his discussion pages 123-141.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

But it is in his appendix, in which he brings together nearly two hundred of Father Tabb's poems hitherto unpublished, that Dr. Litz makes his chief contribution to his subject. These poems are drawn mainly from a highly interesting album of manuscripts collected by the poet's friend, the lamented Dr. William Hand Browne, and from an even larger collection of manuscripts preserved by another friend of the poet's, the Rev. Daniel J. O'Connor. It is no small achievement to have collected and published for the first time so large a body of the verse of so considerable a poet as Father Tabb. We have, in effect, a new volume of Tabb's poems, a volume but little inferior to more than one of the volumes published during the poet's life-time. Besides these Dr. Litz reprints from the newspapers and magazines some forty poems published by the poet but not heretofore collected.

Dr. Litz promises (on page 181 of his study) a collected edition of Tabb's poems. It is earnestly to be hoped that he will make good this promise. For although Tabb, by reason of his subtlety and his compactness, will never make a wide or an enthusiastic popular appeal, he is a poet to be reckoned with. And a full and carefully edited collection of his poems will go far toward securing for him his rightful place in the esteem of the reading public.

KILLIS CAMPBELL.

University of Texas.

Eighteenth Century Readings. BY ALBERT SCHINZ. New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1923.

Ce nouveau volume de M. Schinz fait suite aux *Seventeenth Century readings* du même auteur et correspond au même objet. Il rendra encore plus de services que son prédécesseur, puisqu'il n'existait jusqu'ici aucun ouvrage pratique permettant de donner aux élèves des collèges une connaissance même superficielle des textes les plus importants du dix-huitième siècle, et que les éditions d'ouvrages séparés étaient fort rares. M. Schinz a volontairement restreint son choix aux auteurs les plus connus du siècle. On retrouvera là les extraits que l'on s'attendait à trouver de Voltaire, de Montesquieu, de Rousseau, de Buffon, de Diderot, etc., bien présentés, précédés de notices explicatives rédigées spécialement au

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

point de vue des élèves américains, et des indications bibliographiques qui permettront d'aiguiller des recherches et des lectures plus poussées. Un ouvrage de ce genre ne peut être ni complet ni trop compliqué. On peut se demander cependant si M. Schinz n'a pas parfois poussé un peu trop loin le désir de simplification. La première phrase de *l'Introduction* me paraît à cet égard particulièrement regrettable: "Strictement parlant, dit M. Schinz, le XVIIIme siècle politique, philosophique et littéraire va de 1715 (date de la mort de Louis XIV) à 1789 (date de la prise de la Bastille) c.à.d. à la Révolution française." M. Schinz sait mieux que tout autre qu'il n'en est rien et que c'est là précisément l'idée fausse qu'il faut s'attacher à détruire au début même de toute étude sur le dix-huitième siècle. Fort heureusement M. Schinz ne se tient pas à ce programme étroit et donne des extraits copieux des *Précurseurs,* Saint Simon, Bayle et Fontenelle. Mais ni Bayle, ni Fontenelle n'étaient des isolés et il aurait peut-être valu la peine de le dire plus nettement.

Les extraits sont en général choisis parmi les passages les plus caractéristiques des auteurs cités. Il me sera permis de trouver cependant que la part faite à Lesage, dont on peut facilement se procurer des éditions abrégées, est trop belle, surtout quand on constate l'absence de tout extrait de l'abbé Prévost. Je regrette également que M. Schinz n'ait pas supprimé un des trop longs et trop fameux passages de Buffon, pour nous donner un extrait des *Epoques de la nature.*

GILBERT CHINARD.

Johns Hopkins University.

La Tragédie française et le théâtre hollandais au dix-septième siècle. I. *L'Influence de Corneille.* Par J. Bauwens, Amsterdam, A. H. Kruyt, 1921. 274 pp.

This thesis (doctorat de l'université, Paris) is chiefly concerned with Dutch translations of Pierre Corneille. Introductory pages are devoted to a résumé of Dutch literature and its relations to French before the seventeenth century. Some attention is also given to the influence exerted upon other works than translations by Corneille's tragedies and dramatic theories. M. Bauwens, whom no one

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

will accuse of chauvinism, holds that the essentially Philistine characteristics of his fellow countrymen have made it difficult for them to appreciate French literature, although they imitated and translated extensively classical French tragedies, just as they had previously imitated mediaeval romances and the verse of the *rhétoriqueurs.* Translations of French plays are found more largely in the second than in the first half of the seventeenth century in spite of the fact that it was during that period that France became the political enemy of Holland. Translations of Corneille are found chiefly after 1680, though the *Cid, Horace,* the *Menteur,* and *Héraclius* were translated not long after they were published. Indeed Corneille did not become popular among the Dutch until after Racine, but eventually his influence was universally felt. Unfortunately it was exerted through inferior translations and was far from being beneficial. "Elle n'a point tué le génie de nos auteurs . . . pour la bonne raison qu'ils n'en avaient point" (p. 227), but it taught them little more than dramatic technique and to banish "de leurs pièces le pathétique brutal et grossier qui les avaient peu à peu envahies" (p. 259). His finer qualities were little appreciated by his translators. Thus, for example, the famous "qu'il mourût" is turned by a commonplace when, as B. remarks, it would have been very easy to find the Dutch equivalent (p. 105). Pauline's line

Mon Polyeucte touche à son heure dernière

becomes "Do you see the great danger my bedfellow is in?"[1] Heemskerck, translator of the *Cid,* is prosaic; John de Witt, to whom B. attributes the translation of *Horace,* is prolix; *Ryk* unites the faults of both in his translation of *Polyeucte, Rodogune, Héraclius, Andromède.* Even the translation of *Nicomède* deserves little praise, though made by the "Dutch Sapho," Kataryne Lescailje, daughter of a refugee from Geneva. "Cette fois," writes B., "j'étais fermement décidé à admirer non seulement ce qui serait admirable, mais tout ce qui s' élèverait de si peu que ce fût, au-dessus du médiocre, mais j'y ai perdu mes peines" (p. 193).

After reading the sections devoted to Dutch plays other than translations, I am left uncertain as to whether B. has taken into consideration the possible influence of Corneille's contemporaries.

[1] Gy ziet het groot gevaar van mynen Bedgenoot (p. 147).

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

Does *Constantinus de Groote* (p. 215), for instance, owe anything to Tristan l'Hermite, *Arminius* (p. 215) to Scudéry, *Sophonisba* (p. 222) to Mairet? It is possible that *Pertharite,* as well as other tragedies by Corneille, may have influenced *Verloofde Konincks-bruidt* (p. 204). *Admetus et Alcestis* (p. 220) certainly goes back to Euripides, despite the substitution of Philip of Macedon for Hercules.

The first appendix, in which extensive use is made of Worp's *Geschiedenis van het Drama en van het Tooneel in Nederland,* gives an interesting list of French plays translated into Dutch during the seventeenth century. One is surprised to find more than fifty dramatists figuring there and that translations of such comparatively little known plays as Magnon's *Oroondate,* Montfleury's *Mariage de rien,* and Quinault's *Astrate* were edited more frequently than *Polyeucte, Tartuffe,* or *Phèdre.* This fact shows how hard it is to form an estimate of French influence on the Dutch theater from the study of Corneille alone. Before B. publishes his chapters on other authors, I should like to call his attention to certain errors in the list besides those indicated by M. Galas.[2]

The system of dating the French plays is unfortunate. At one time the date of first representation is given, at another that of printing, but rarely is one told which is meant. As a matter of fact, the important date here is that of publication, for it is improbable that any of the plays were translated from the manuscript. *Laure persécutée* was first published in 1639, not 1649; *Roxane* in 1640, not 1647; *Sainte Catherine* in 1643, not 1644; *la Jalouse d'elle-même* in 1650, not 1659; *Lubin* in 1661, not 1652.[3] 1641 is too early a date either for the acting or the printing of *Pompée.* Different dates are assigned to *Thomas Morus* on pp. 262 and 263. The dating of *La mort de Brute et de Porcie,* 1673 instead of 1637, is evidently a misprint. *L'Art de régner* was written by Gillet de la Tessonerie, not by Gabriel Gilbert. Dr. Bussom has shown in his dissertation on Pradon, too recently for B. to have consulted it, that the initial *N.* should not be assigned to this dramatist.

[2] *R. L. C.*, III (1923), 166-168.

[3] The mistake is probably due to a misprint in the *Bibliothèque du théâtre françois*, Dresden, 1768, III, 38. There is a copy of the edition of 1661 in the Collection Rondel.

Digitized by Google
Original from
UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

On the whole, B.'s laborious undertaking, carried out with the patience that he attributes to his compatriots and the taste that he denies them, merits the thanks of those who are interested in the spread of French literature abroad. It is to be hoped that he will soon publish the remaining chapters of his work, to be devoted to Racine, Thomas Corneille, Quinault and other dramatists of the period.

H. CARRINGTON LANCASTER.

Hauptfragen der Romanistik. Festschrift für Philipp August Becker. Heidelberg, Winter, 1922, 322 pp.

Les *Hauptfragen der Romanistik* sont un ouvrage dédié à M. Philipp August Becker à l'occasion du soixantième anniversaire de ce savant. Après une introduction qui donne la liste des écrits de M. Becker, vient une série d'articles par quelques-uns des romanistes les plus connus de l'Allemagne et de l'Autriche. Ces articles sont divisés en trois groupes. Le premier groupe traite de problèmes linguistiques, le deuxième d'un sujet relevant à la fois de la langue et de la littérature, le troisième groupe de questions littéraires. Le volume contient les articles suivants:

(1) Karl von Ettmayer, "Die Rolle der Verba vicaria im poetischen Stil Lafontaines" ; Matthias Friedwagner, "Zur Aussprache des lateinischen C vor hellen Vokalen"; Ernst Gamillscheg, "Zur sprachlichen Gliederung Frankreichs"; Leo Jordan, "Die verbale Negation bei Rabelais und die Methode psychologischer Einfühlung in der Sprachwissenschaft"; Eugen Lerch, "Die Aufgaben der romanischen Syntax"; Erhard Lommatzsch, "Deiktische Elemente im Altfranzösischen"; Wilhelm Meyer-Lübke, "Zentripetale Kräfte im Sprachleben"; Gustav Rieder, "Probleme des Kriegsfranzösischen"; Karl Vossler, "Neue Denkformen im Vulgärlatein"; (2) Josef Brüch, "Literaturgeschichte und Sprachgeschichte." (3) Hanns Heiss, "Zur Charakterisierung der französichen Literatur des 19. Jahrhunderts;" Victor Klemperer, "Der fremde Dante;" Fritz Neubert, "Französische Rokokoprobleme;" Emil Winkler, "Das Kunstproblem der Tierdichtung, besonders der Tierfabel." Qu'il nous soit permis de rendre compte de quelques-unes de ces études qui précisent en des points particuliers la méthode de la philologie romane.

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

M. Friedwagner reprend la question de l'altération du *c* latin devant *e* et *i*, qui a tant de fois déjà été étudiée.

Il rappelle qu'avec la fixation d'une date pour un phénomène phonétique dans une région déterminée la question est loin d'être résolue. Il prend comme point de départ deux noms de lieu de la province rhétique (en Vindélicie, c'est-à-dire dans la Bavière moderne) qui, encore aujourd'hui, présentent le *c* latin. L'*Itinerarium Antonini Augusti et Hierosolymitanum* contient la forme *Celio monte* qu'on a identifiée avec Kellmünz, dans la Souabe bavaroise, où passe une route romaine. M. Friedwagner se demande à quelle époque et dans quelles conditions les Alemans ont entendu la forme * *Kelimonte,* qui est la base de Kellmünz. La rive droite de l'Iller, où se trouve Kellmünz, est encore restée pendant deux cents ans au pouvoir des légionnaires après la perte de la rive gauche dont parle Ammien. Kellmünz a dû passer au pouvoir des Alemans vers 470. Il n'est pas probable que les envahisseurs aient prononcé le nom de cet endroit autrement que les habitants gallo-romains. Il faut donc admettre que vers 470 on prononçait encore dans cette région le *k* devant *e,* ou du moins un son voisin, tel que *k'*.

La *Tabula Peutingeriana* établit les distances des stations de Vindélicie les unes des autres; l'une de ces stations sur la rive gauche du Danube est *Celeusum.* On a reconnu cette forme dans le nom du Kelsbach qui coule non loin des lieux nommés dans la Table. Or d'une *Notitia dignitatum,* écrit militaire de l'année 400, on conclut qu'encore au commencement du V^me^ siècle des camps fortifiés romains se défendaient sur la rive gauche du Danube. Lors du rappel des légionnaires, la population civile a dû rester au moins en partie, et ce sont les paysans de la contrée que les envahisseurs entendaient prononcer *Celeusum.* Cette région ayant été conquise au commencement du sixième siècle, M. Friedwagner en conclut qu'à cette époque on y prononçait encore le *k* latin devant *e.*

M. Friedwagner termine son article par une critique des déductions qu'on avait voulu tirer de certains noms de lieu de la Suisse allemande pour déterminer approximativement la date de l'altération du *c* latin. Ainsi il récuse le témoignage de *Kempraten,* dans lequel M. Meyer-Lübke avait voulu voir un *Centum prata,* forme attestée par un texte de l'année 741. M. Friedwagner pense qu'il s'agirait plutôt d'un mot celtique tel que *Cambo*—qu'on trouve dans certains noms de lieu comme *Kempten.* De plus dans le cas de *Kempraten*

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

les consonnes au commencement des syllabes sont toutes trois sujettes à caution (on s'attendrait par exemple à ce que le *p* devienne *pf*). L'étymologie proposée paraît donc devoir être mise en doute, et il faut voir dans le *Centum prata* de 741 une étymologie du scribe qui cherche à expliquer une forme qu'il ne comprenait pas.

De même il faut faire des réserves sur les conclusions que M. Meyer-Lübke a voulu tirer du nom de lieu *Cerlier* (en allemand *Erlach*), et pour lequel M. Meyer-Lübke prend comme base **Caerelliacum.* Les Alemans auraient, vers 455 déjà, entendu Tserlako, et auraient identifié le son initial à leur préposition *to* (en all. mod. *zu*), avec chute de la voyelle de la préposition. M. Friedwagner, pour des raisons historiques, récuse ce témoignage. On pourrait ajouter qu'il est difficile d'admettre que la voyelle de la préposition ait pu disparaître déjà à cette époque. Le *u* de *zu* ne tombe que dans les patois modernes. Le nom allemand n'est pas nécessairement né au moment où les Allemands sont arrivés devant la ville. La plus ancienne forme allemande de ce nom de lieu contient un H au commencement du mot, sans que l'on sache d'où vient cet H. Les formes *Centum prata* et **Caerelliacum* ne sauraient donc servir à dater le phénomène de l'altération du *c* latin devant *e* et *i*.

Il serait intéressant de soumettre à la méthode critique de M. Friedwagner les noms de lieu de la Suisse allemande *Kerzers* et *Kehrsiten,* dans lesquels MM. Gauchat et Jud voient sauf erreur **Ceresetum. Kerzers* (en fr. *Chiètres*) se trouve dans une partie de la Suisse qui a été germanisée au sixième siècle, alors que *Kehrsiten* ne l'a pas été avant le septième siècle. Il faut donc, pour cette partie de l'empire romain, admettre un *k* encore plus tard que pour la région autour de Kellmünz et du Kelsbach.

Un autre article qui a le mérite d'attirer l'attention sur des points de méthode est celui de M. Eugen Lerch, intitulé *"Die Aufgaben der romanischen Syntax".* M. Lerch rappelle qu'il y avait jusqu'ici deux méthodes à suivre lorsqu'on abordait une question de syntaxe dans une langue romane. Ou bien l'on partait du latin et l'on étudiait les changements qu'a subis la construction latine à travers les siècles; ou bien, en partant de la construction moderne, on remontait jusqu'au latin. Dans les deux cas les faits de syntaxe étaient considérés comme le résultat d'une évolution; leur explication ne pouvait donc être qu'historique. La méthode qui consiste à comparer les faits de syntaxe communs aux différentes langues ro-

Digitized by Google | Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

manes est à l'heure qu'il est assez avancée, alors qu'à l'exception de quelques remarques dans les travaux de Vossler on n'a pas encore insisté sur les différences syntaxiques par lesquelles se distinguent ces langues.

M. Lerch rappelle également que pour ceux qui ont à enseigner une langue, il est de toute importance de connaître la raison d'être des faits de syntaxe, c'est-à-dire leur évolution du latin. Pourtant depuis plusieurs années l'unanimité sur la question de savoir s'il convient d'étudier historiquement une langue a cessé d'exister. J. Haas, dans sa "*Französische Syntax*," avait préconisé une méthode descriptive dans l'étude d'un état de langage, c'est-à-dire qu'on expliquerait un phénomène de syntaxe par l'idée que s'en fait le sujet parlant, qui n'a pas conscience d'une évolution quand il parle sa langue maternelle. Par exemple, dans la phrase anglaise "the king was offered a seat" l'ancien datif *the king* n'est plus senti comme tel. Pour un Anglais *the king* est devenu un nominatif, puisqu'on dit "HE *was offered a seat*." Du point de vue du sujet parlant, il serait faux de voir en *the king* un datif et de l'expliquer comme tel.[1]

M. Lerch explique aussi d'une manière intéressante la raison de l'emploi du subjonctif après *quoique*. A un moment donné un instinct obscur a porté l'individu parlant français à considérer l'indicatif après *quoique* comme vulgaire. Voulant parler bien il emploie le subjonctif. Les parallèles que M. Lerch a trouvés en allemand s'expliquent de même. La forme incorrecte *er frug* tend de plus en plus à remplacer *er fragte*, qu'on estime moins beau, moins "noble." Ces tendances, sociales dans leur origine, devront être étudiées et serviront à expliquer un grand nombre de formations syntaxiques

[1] Voilà des idées où M. Lerch a sans contredit subi l'influence du *Traité de stylistique* de M. Charles Bally. Des parallèles s'imposent un peu partout, qui montrent jusqu'à quel point M. Lerch est imbu des idées du savant genevois. En voici un exemple. Dans les *Hauptfragen* nous lisons à la page 91: "Für das Bewusstsein des Sprechenden ist die Sprache nichts Gewordenes und Werdendes, . . . sondern etwas Konstantes. Er pflegt nicht über die Sprache zu reflektieren, er weiss nichts davon, dass sie eine Geschichte hat," et dans le *Traité de stylistique*, à la page 21: "Le sujet qui parle spontanément sa langue maternelle a tout le temps conscience d'un *état*, nullement d'une *évolution*, ni d'une perspective dans le temps. A moins d'être un érudit, il vit dans l'illusion que la langue qu'il parle a toujours existé telle qu'il la parle."

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

nouvelles. Dans la grande majorité des cas, ces formations analogiques sont destinées à disparaître. Quand et pourquoi parviennent-elles à l'emporter? Quand une faute se répétera-t-elle si souvent qu'elle finira par être seule admise comme correcte? Pour être acceptée par l'entourage du sujet parlant, la forme incorrectement employée par celui-ci doit répondre à un besoin, à une certaine façon de sentir et de penser de ce même milieu. Pour la syntaxe il s'agit donc d'étudier les différents milieux sociaux où pourront se développer ces formations nouvelles. Chez tous les hommes il y a une tendance très forte à repousser toute innovation de langage, une sorte de contrainte sociale qui empêchera le développement trop intense des formations nouvelles. En parlant l'individu se conforme au milieu dans lequel il se trouve. M. Lerch rappelle que les écrits de Meillet et de Bally, tous deux élèves de F. de Saussure, soulignent la valeur évocatrice des faits d'expression. Ceux-ci ont la faculté d'évoquer des milieux par contraste avec la langue de tous les jours. Ces faits d'évocation pourront venir des couches sociales supérieures, ou bien du peuple, l'argot étant la contrepartie de la langue "écrite."[2] Alors que les "latinismes" de la Renaissance viennent d'en haut, un grand nombre, non seulement de mots, mais aussi de tournures syntaxiques viennent des classes inférieures de la population. Ceci est vrai aussi pour la prononciation. Après la Révolution on se moqua de ceux qui s'obstinaient à dire *roè* pour *roi*: la prononciation de la bonne société a été influencée en ce point par les habitudes phonétiques du peuple de Paris. Alors qu'il était autrefois impossible de remplacer *ce suis-je par c'est moi,* il l'est tout autant de dire aujourd'hui autre chose que *c'est moi.*

M. Lerch dit très bien que l'opposition entre la méthode "sociale" et la méthode historique n'est qu'apparente. Il dit: "Wer die Gegenwart studiert, studiert eben auch Geschichte: das Nebeneinander der verschiedenen Wendungen wird ihm von selbst zu einem Nacheinander."[3]

En résumé M. Lerch voudrait que l'on précisât pour tout fait syntaxique (1) son premier emploi dans les textes; (2) la raison de son emploi; (3) la raison de la conservation et de la diffusion de ce fait de syntaxe. Ici il faudra voir d'abord en quoi il répond à un be-

[2] Voir Bally, *Traité de stylistique*, p. 227.

[3] *Hauptfragen*, p. 98.

Digitized by Google

Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

soin ; puis on examinera le milieu social dans lequel il aura pris naissance et les différents milieux par lesquels il aura passé avant d'être généralement admis à l'exclusion de tout autre fait de syntaxe.

En terminant ce compte-rendu sommaire de deux articles parus dans les *Hauptfragen der Romanistik,* nous ne pouvons que regretter de n'avoir pu dire au moins quelques mots des autres études, de celles surtout où M. Meyer-Lübke étudie ce qu'il nomme les forces centripètes dans le langage (*Zentripetale Kräfte im Sprachleben*) et M. Vossler des formes nouvelles de pensée en latin vulgaire (*Neue Denkformen im Vulgärlatein*). Nous n'avons voulu que signaler ici un recueil que l'on peut comparer à plus d'un titre aux célèbres *Bausteine zur romanischen Philologie,* dédiés à A. Mussafia en 1905.

OTTO MÜLLER.

University of Pennsylvania.

CORRESPONDENCE

Helmbrecht, 1251

Among the occasional passages in the MHG epic *Meier Helmbrecht* (*ca.* 1250) which still offer difficulty are the lines in which the hero, who has given up his present life to enter the services of a robber knight, tells of the tortures he metes out to the peasants he robs. He says:

1243 dem ich daz ouge ûz drucke,
disen hâhe (houwe?) ich in den rucke,
disen bind ich in den âmeizstoc,
enem ziuhe ich den loc
mit der zangen ûz dem barte,
dem andern rîz ich die swarte,
enem mülle ich die lide,
1250 disen henk ich in die wide
bî den sparrâdern sîn.

The difficulty in the last two lines lies in the meaning of the word *sparrâdern.* The MHG dictionaries lead one astray here. Benecke-Müller-Zarncke: *Mhd. Wörterbuch.* I, 10; Schmeller: *Bairisches Wörterbuch*[2], II, 681; Schade: *Altdeutsches Wörterbuch*[2], II, 847; Lexer: *Handwörterbuch,* II, 1070, and his *Mhd. Taschenwörterbuch*[12], 239, all carry as the meaning of this word: *varix, Krampfader.* Following the MHG dictionaries, then, the translation would read: "This one I hang with a withe by his varicose veins," —a manifest absurdity, unless, indeed, the improbable assumption

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

were made that we have here a derisive reference to the lower leg generally.

Grimm's *Wörterbuch* and Diefenbach's *Glossarium Latino-Germanicum* (*s. v. varex,* 606) carry, along with other definitions, the basal meaning of this word, namely 'sinews.' The word *ader* itself often had this same meaning; it was formerly used in a very general sense, including the nerves, sinews, ligaments, muscles, and even the intestines.[1] Thus Vegetius[2] speaks of "*schiesszeug mit adern bezogen.*" Ulrich von Liechtenstein, in his *Frauendienst* (108, 18), telling how his finger was torn from his hand in a joust, says that "*der vinger an einer âder hie.*" And Hans Sachs (1560, II, IV, 55a), using the word with similar meaning, has the wolf say: "*Ytzt wil ich mich wol nagen sat der ochssen adern am armprust.*" Grimm's *Wörterbuch* also clears up the meaning of the first half of the compound, *sparr-* (*sperr-*). Because of their similarity both of form and of meaning, there has been a great amount of confusion and interaction between the verbs *sparren, sperren,* and *spannen.* Although the parallel forms *sparren* and *sperren* have the meaning *hemmen, hindern,* we see a transition toward *spannen* through the meanings *aufsperren, dehnen, spannen.* These verbs were in part synonyms. The first definition of *sperren* given in Benecke-Müller-Zarncke (II^2, 4) is: *spannen, mit Gewalt auf, an, oder aus einander dehnen.* The exhaustive *Belege* which Grimm records *s. v. sperren* makes clear beyond doubt the intimate relationship between *sperren* and *spannen.* Citations with the synonymous use of the two verbs are presented, as well as compound nouns analogous to *sparrâder,* such as: *sperrlaken* (= *ein Tuch, das ausgespannt wird*) and *sperrwagen* (= *Wagen, über dem eine Decke gebreitet, ein Tuch gespannt wird.*) The MHG verb *sparren* and the substantive *sparr-* (= *spann-*) died aut, whereas *sperren* and *Sperre* have survived in NHG.

With the meaning of *sparrader* established as *spanader, senader, Sehne,* = 'sinew,' it remains to consider whether there is anything in the connotation of the word or in its recorded use to indicate by what sinews Helmbrecht suspended his victims. Translators of the *Helmbrecht* into modern German interpret the passage to mean 'hang by the heels.'[3] These versions in modern German hardly pretend to philological accuracy, nor do they attain it here. It may be interesting to note the two ways by which this meaning

[1] *Cf.* Hyrtl: *Die alten d. Kunstworte in der Anat.*, Wien, 1884, 2 ff.

[2] *Vier bücher Ritterschaft*, Augsburg, 1529, IV, 9.

[3] Thus Gustav Freytag translates (*Bilder aus der d. Vergangenheit,* II, Kap. 21): "*den hänge ich bei seinen Beinen an die Weide.*" And the latest translation, that by F. Bergemann (Inselbücherei, Nr. 304, 1920?) reads similarly: "*und hänge auch Kopfnieder manch einen an den Füssen auf.*" Several other existing translations I have not seen.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

could have been derived, each of which involves error. (1) Remarkably enough, Grimm (after Diefenbach-Wülcker, 856) records (10:1, 1891) the occurrence of *spannader* with the meaning *calcaneus.* The inaccuracy involved here has already been pointed out by Hyrtl (*op. cit.,* 144 f.): "*Eine noch nicht dagewesene Verwendung des* calcaneus *enthält der* Vocabularius teutonico-lat. *von Zeninger, als 'spanader.' Da spanader = Sehne ist, kann mit dieser spanader nur die Achillessehne gemeint sein, welche sich am Fersenbein ansetzt.*" (2) In addition to the ordinary hyphenation to read *sparr-âdern* there is the possibility of reading *spar-râdern,* = 'spur-wheels,' figurative for 'heels.' But there is fatal objection to this reading from the standpoint both of form and of meaning. The form of the word which we should then have is *sporredern.* Vowel variation in both roots of the compound is not probable. Grimm and Diefenbach carry the word in its essential form. Further objection lodges against the meaning which this interpretation gives. In the course of the 13th century the rowel spur, did, indeed, come into general use in Germany, replacing the type with a single prong or prick; and these were worn, too, by peasants. Neidhart furnishes interesting testimony (*Nîth.* 75, 9):

Rädelohte sporen treit mir
Fridebreht ze leide.

There is ample evidence that the peasants of the period in question were encroaching more and more upon the prerogatives of the knights, until in the latter half of the 13th century the distinction between the dress and armor of the knights and the festal dress of the wealthy, ambitious young peasant fop had entirely disappeared.[4] But it is highly improbable that spurs were worn by the peaceful, work-a-day peasants who, in contrast to Helmbrecht, staid by the plow, whose farms Helmbrecht plundered, and whom he so ruthlessly tortured. Furthermore, even though the figurative use of the word might have been common among knights, Helmbrecht would not naturally have spoken of his crude victims in terms of knightly equipment.

II. Samuel 8, 4, which reads: "And David hocked all the chariot horses," appears in the MHG Bible: "*und schneid ab alle die knischeiben der wagenpfert.*" In other texts this passage occurs with the variants *sparradern, spanadern.*[5] *Sparradern* here, then, means 'the hamstrings,' or 'sinews of the hough.' This usage finds confirmation, too, in Diefenbach (606), where *s. v.*

[4] *Cf.* Martin Manlik: *Das Leben und Treiben der Bauern Südostdeutschlands im* 14. *Jh.* In: *Jahresbericht des K. K. Gym. in Mähr. Weisskirchen,* 1887-88. 6 ff.

[5] *Cf.* Kurrelmeyer: *Die erste deutsche Bibel,* v, in: *Bib. des Litterar. Vereins in Stuttgart,* 1908, vol. 249, p. 160.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

varex we find among other definitions: *kniader, de zene* (= *Sehne*) *under dem kyne.* So while the word in question meant 'sinews' generally, usage is also recorded which applies the word specifically to the hamstrings, and in one case to the tendon of Achilles: this would give us a hanging such as would be directly suggested by the universal method of suspending the carcasses of slaughtered animals. In this connection attention may be called to the word *sperrholz* (Grimm, *Wb.*, 10:1, 2186). This is a piece of wood still to be seen in use by butchers in parts of Germany, with which the hind legs of a slaughtered animal are spread apart and by which the body is then hanged.

The disappearance of *sparren* (= *spannen*) mentioned above would naturally lead to a growing unintelligibility of the word *sparrader.* One can discern the evidence of such a tendency in the citations carried in Grimm. The greatest confusion developed as to the meaning of the word. For example, although we find the proper usage (= 'sinews' in Agricola's *Sprichwörter* (278):

> "es lassen yhn die fürsten und herren gern dienen, also dasz die diener vor yhnen stehen müssen, welches denn eyn grosse Arbeit ist und endtlich vil schadens thut, denn die sparradern entschlaffen und machen lam, wie man denn an den pferdenn sihet, die yhre beyn abstehen, und können darnach nyrgent fort kommen,"

Seuter's *Roszarznei* (Augsburg, 1599 fol.) contains the passages: "*Man soll dem pferdt die sporadern schlagen.*" "*Die seitenader, so man nendt die sporader.*" And Frisch, *Teutsch-Lateinisches Wörterbuch* (1741) gives the definition (305): "*Spornader, oder Seitenader, um die Gegend an der Seite, wo der Sporn des Reitenden hinsticht,* vena lateralis." It seems apparent that we have here a case of popular etymology which, although some centuries old, has never been challenged.

Old anatomies record several words which should be considered in this connection. In Bauman's *Kurzer Auszug aus den büchern des hochgelehrten Andree Vesalii* (Nurnberg, 1551, fol.) the word *sporader* occurs with reference to human anatomy. Hyrtl comments upon the word as follows (*op. cit.*, 144): "*Die Aeste der* vena saphena interna, *welche zwischen Fersenbein und innerem Knöchel in reichlicher Menge liegen, werden im deutschen Vesal als 'Sporadern' erwähnt. Das Fersenbein und die Ferse heissen . . . auch Spoyre, Spor und Gespor* (Dief., pag. 91 *und* 92), *weil der spitze Stachel zum Antreiben des Pferdes, schon im Strycker Sporn genannt, am Fersenabsatz des Reiterstiefels festgemacht wurde. Ein Blutgefäss in der Nähe des Spors mag somit* pace mea *Sporader heissen.*" This would seem to illustrate further our preceding remark concerning the growing unintelligibility of the old word *sparrader* = 'sinew,' and to afford a popular etymology analogous to that pointed out above. Hyrtl explains the words

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

Sporbein (= *Fersenbein*) (144), and *Spornbein* (= *Wadenbein*) (79) on the basis of similar analogies. If, as we doubt, a connection exists between these two words and *sparrader*, we would have an explanation: *sparr* = *spor* rather than *sperr*, = *span*.

CLAIR HAYDEN BELL.

University of California.

CHAUCER AND VENANTIUS FORTUNATUS

Chaucer's

The briddes, that han left hir song
Whyl they han suffred cold so strong. . . .
Than doth the nightingale hir might
To make noyse and singen blythe.

is the translation of *Roman de la Rose* 67-8, 74-5 (ed. Langlois):

Li oisel, qui se sont teü
Tant come il ont le froit eü. . . .
Li rossigniaus lores s'esforce
De chanter et de faire noise.

Part of Langlois' note on the passage is as follows: "Un lecteur du XIVe siècle a noté en marge du MS. Me, au début de la description du printemps: *Totum istud punctum Matheus Vindocinensis . . . de loco placidi descriptione.* Il est possible que Guillaume ait connu les descriptions de Mathieu de Vendôme; voici quelques vers latins dont il pourrait s'être inspiré:

. . . Altera gratuitas superest cumulantque decorem
Organice studio garrulitatis aves. . . .
Ergo relativos volucrum queremonia cantus
Dum movet, organicum carmen adesse putes.
(*Descriptio loci ameni*)

. . . . Le prototype de tous ces vergers paraît être le paradis d'Amours de Tibulle [1. 3. 59-60]:

Hic choreæ cantusque vigent, passimque vagantes
Dulce sonant tenui gutture carmen aves. . . .

For our purpose, it is important to note that, after the first two lines quoted from the twelfth-century Matthew of Vendome, Langlois omits these two:

Vociferans 'occide,' dolens philomela querelat,
Et sua jocundo damna dolore canit.

After these, thirty lines are interposed before Langlois' other two lines occur (see Bourgain, *Matthæi Vindocinensis Ars Versifica-*

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

toria,[1] pp. 44-5; Wright and Halliwell, *Reliquiæ Antiquiæ* 2. 269).

The occurrence of *organice, organicum,* in the lines by Matthew of Vendome seems to point to the following four lines from the Easter poem [2] of Venantius Fortunatus (ed. Leo, 3. 9. 27-30):

Ad cantus revocatur aves, quæ carmine clauso
  Pigrior hiberno frigore muta fuit.
Hinc filomela suis adtemperat *organa* [3] cannis,
  Fitque repercusso dulcior aura melo.

---

[1] Is it possible that Keats' *To Autumn* 2, "Close bosom-friend to the maturing sun," may be related to Matthew's *Descriptio Temporis* 3 (Bourgain, p. 40; *Red. Ant.*, p. 266), "Solis amica calet estas"? Matthew is partial to this figure: thus, *rosa veris amica, vaccinia naris amica, naris amicus odor* (Bourgain, p. 43); *fagus amica Jovis* (43); *brevitas auris amica* (44); *auris amica est volucris* (45); *flos veris amicus* (46). The classic poets, regarding *amicus* as an adjective, prefer the dative for the dependent noun: Horace, *Ep.* 1. 2. 26; Ovid, *Am.* 2. 18. 26; etc.

[2] For this see Julian, *Dict. of Hymnology,* p. 1139; Schaff, *Christ in Song,* p. 235.

[3] Cf. Chaucer, *Nun's Priest's Tale* 30-2:

In al the land of crowing nas his peer.
His vois was merier than the mery orgon
On messe-dayes that in the chirche gon.

May not Chaucer have derived this hint from the Easter poem?

There is actually an organ-bird, so-called, a native of South America, which I find first mentioned in H. W. Bates' *The Naturalist on the Amazons,* first published in 1863. His account of it is as follows (Vol. II, pp. 400-1; reprint of 1892, p. 380): "I frequently heard in the neighborhood of these huts [at St. Paulo de Olivenca: San Pablo Olivenca; cf. *Encyc. Brit.*, 11th ed., Vol. IV, p. 440, B2] the 'realejo' or organ bird (Cyphorhinus cantans), the most remarkable songster, by far, of the Amazonian forests. When its singular notes strike the ear for the first time, the impression cannot be resisted that they are produced by a human voice. Some musical boy must be gathering fruit in the thickets, and is singing a few notes to cheer himself. The tones become more fluty and plaintive; they are now those of a flageolet, and, notwithstanding the utter impossibility of the thing, one is for the moment convinced that somebody is playing that instrument. No bird is to be seen, however closely the surrounding trees and bushes may be scanned, and yet the voice seems to come from the thicket close to one's ears. The ending of the song is rather disappointing. It begins with a few very slow and mellow notes, following each other like the commencement of an air; one listens, expecting to hear a complete strain, but an abrupt pause occurs, and then the song breaks down, finishing with a number of clicking, unmusical sounds, like a piping barrel-organ out of wind and tune. I never heard the bird on the Lower Amazons, and very rarely heard it even at Ega; it is the only songster which makes an impression on the natives, who sometimes rest their paddles while traveling in their small canoes along the shady by-streams, as if struck by the mysterious sounds." For another account of it see C. William Beebe, *Edge of the Jungle,* p. 282, who observed it at Kartabo, in British Guiana, and describes it under the name of the quadrille-bird. For a picture, and other scientific names, see Sclater and Salvin, *Exotic Ornithology,* Pl. 22. Curiously enough, one reads of a bird-organ, as well

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

As Matthew was a man of wide reading, who drew illustrations from various ancient poets (Gröber, *Grundr. der Rom. Phil.* 2. 388), he may well have known this poem of Fortunatus (ca. 535-ca. 600), as he was certainly acquainted (Bourgain, p. xxxi) with Prudentius (348-ca. 410). Indeed, it is the poem of Fortunatus, rather than that of Matthew, which Guillaume may have had before him, since the latter seems to be directly indebted to Fortunatus' lines 27 and 28.

ALBERT STANBURROUGH COOK.

Yale University.

OLD NORSE *Sko*

In his excellent monograph "Sprachkörper und Sprachfunktion," *Palaestra* 135, 1921, Professor Wilhelm Horn has cited (pp. 32-51) several examples of verbs which according to the author represent abbreviated forms due to the imperative function of the verb. Such forms were formerly considered as "verstümmelte" or "mutilated" remains of the full forms, but all efforts to account for the phonetic changes involved have proved unsatisfactory.

Professor Horn proceeds on the theory that such imperative forms represent a type of weakened function, *i. e.*, the imperative has passed over into an interjection whereby the full verbal form is no longer felt as necessary for the expression of the imperative idea and consequently the form is phonetically reduced to a minimum; the situation, gestures, tone of voice, etc., supplanting, as it were, the phonetic loss sustained in this peculiar type of imperative interjection. To quote from the author (p. 34): "Ich habe nur einzuwenden, dass diese Imperative nicht unter die Überschrift "tonschwache Verbalformen" gehören. Sie sind vielmehr bedeutungsschwach oder funktionsschwach, da Situation, Ton und Gebärde den Befehl ausdrücken helfen. Was durch solche Mittel geschieht, braucht nicht durch sprachliche zu erfolgen."

Professor Horn has cited examples from many Indo-European languages with special reference to the Italic and the Germanic languages. It is the latter group of languages which concern us here. Examples quoted from the Germanic languages are among others, (§ 32) Gothic *sai* (*saíhwan*), M. E. *lô* > N. E. *lo* (Angs. *lôca*), Swiss (dial.) *luə* 'behold'; (§ 33) O. H. G. *lâ* 'let,' from the imperative *lâ* the shortened forms became extended to the other tenses of the verb (*lie* pret., etc.); (§§ 36, 37) O. H. G. *gâ, gê* 'go,' from which was developed the whole verbal system of ***gân*: *gên***

as of an organ-bird (*Encyc. Brit.*, 11th ed., Vol. III, p. 434): "There was a very small barrel-organ in use during the 18th and 19th centuries, known as the birdorgan (Fr. *serinette, turlutaine, merline*)."

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

(full form *gangan* Inf.), similarly § 38, O. H. G. *stâ: stê* 'stand'; (§ 41) Angs. (*w*)*uton* used in an adhortative function, cf. (*w*)*uton gangan* 'let us go,' etc.

A very striking example of Professor Horn's theory and one exactly parallel to Gothic *sai,* Eng. *lo,* is O. N. *sko* 'behold,' which can be explained in no other way than as a shortened form of the imperative *skoda* (from *skoda, skodada, skodadr,* cf. Swedish *skåda*). There is no phonetic law which can explain the loss of the final *-da* in *skoda* > *sko.* The reduction of the final syllable in this word must have taken place for exactly the same reason as did the reduction of *-hw* in Gothic *saíhw* > *sai* or of *-ca* in Angs. *lôca* > **lô,* M. E. *lô;* i. e., the form suffered an irregular phonetic reduction due to the interjectional character of the imperative. The O. N. interjection *sko* 'behold' from the imperative *skoda* seems to me to be additional evidence in behalf of Professor Horn's theory regarding "funktionsschwache Imperative."

ALBERT MOREY STURTEVANT.

University of Kansas.

FIRST SONG IN *The Beggar's Bush*

For the sources of the beggars' part in this play, we are customarily referred to the English literature of roguery, whence no doubt the authors derived much of their material. It is clear, however, that one of them, probably Fletcher, had been looking into Erasmus, for the song sung by Higgen in II, i, is a versification of some passages in the colloquy entitled Πτωχολογία (*Coll.,* ed. 1658, 395).

Cast our caps and cares away!
This is beggars' holiday:
At the crowning of our king,
Thus we ever dance and sing.
In the world look out and see,
Where so happy a prince as he?
Where the nation live so free,
And so merry as do we?
Be it peace, or be it war,
Here at liberty we are,
And enjoy our ease and rest:
To the field we are not prest;
Nor are call'd into the town,
To be troubled with the gown:
Hang all offices, we cry,
And the magistrate too, by!
When the subsidy's increased,
We are not a penny cess'd;
Nor will any go to law
With the beggar for a straw.
All which happiness, he brags,
He doth owe unto his rags.

Digitized by Google | Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

I quote from the *Colloquies,* underlining the pertinent passages: Ir. Ego *hanc miseriam ne cum Regum quidem fortuna commutarim.* Nihil enim regno similius, quam mendicitas. . . . Dic mihi, qua re potissimum beati sunt reges? Mi. Quia faciunt quod animo collubitum est. Ir. *Ista libertas, qua nihil suavius nemini regum magis adest, quam nobis.* Nec dubito, quin multi reges sint, qui nobis invideant. *Sive bellum est, sive pax, nos tuto vivimus: non describimur ad militiam, non vocamur ad munia publica, non censemur cum populus expilatur exactionibus,* nullus inquirit in vitam nostram: si quid admissum est etiam atrocius, *quis dignetur in jus vocare mendicum? Etiam si pulsamus hominem, pudet pugnare cum mendico.* Regibus nec in pace, nec in bello licet suaviter agere; & quo majores sunt, hoc plures metuunt. Nos, veluti Deo sacros, etiam religione quadam metuit vulgus offendere. Mi. Sed interim sordescitis in pannis, & casulis. Ir. Quid ista faciunt ad veram felicitatem? Extra hominem sunt, quae narras. *His pannis debemus nostram felicitatem.*

William Dinsmore Briggs.

Stanford University.

Sylvestre Bonnard's Fairy Again

I have ventured (*M. L. N.* xxxvii, 56-58) to suggest a "kinship of imagination" between Sylvestre's fairy and the Eros met by Philetas in *Daphnis and Chloe.* Professor van Roosbroeck (*M. L. N.* xxxvii, 248-250) quotes a closer verbal parallel from *La Poupée* of Bibiena. I specifically stated that I was not proposing a *source;* the present note is intended merely to prove by the book that Anatole France relished *Daphnis and Chloe* and the Eros episode.

In *Le Jardin d'Epicure* (pp. 40-42) there is a brief appreciation of the story as a sort of fairy tale. The first essay in *Le Génie Latin* is a keen study of the inspiration of the "*fables milésiennes*" and particularly of *Daphnis and Chloe.* On page 7 we read: "Ailleurs, dans une scène de vendange, le bonhomme Philétas ne paraît que pour conter avec grâce qu'il a vu un enfant ailé dans son jardin. Et ce qu'il conte est tout à fait dans le goût de *l'Amour mouillé* d'Anacréon." I recall no mention of *Daphnis and Chloe* in *Le Crime de Sylvestre Bonnard* but the old scholar compares the child who brings him the *Légende Dorée* to *l'Amour mouillé* (p. 88, Calmann-Lévy ed.)

Having reread the passages in question, I reaffirm the "kinship of imagination," which I find closer between Philetas and Sylvestre than elsewhere.

Benjamin M. Woodbridge.

Reed College.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

BRIEF MENTION

The Rise of Universities. By Charles H. Haskins (Henry Holt and Co., N. Y., 1923. 134 pp.). This volume, the three Colver Lectures delivered at Brown University in 1923, is not so much a *fait accompli* (it is that too) as an omen. The recent war has stimulated an interest in our intellectual origins, and the study before us is one of the many happy signs (Dean Haskins is president of the American Council of Learned Societies which is undertaking an organized study of mediæval Latin culture) of a renewed and broader interest in the much-maligned Middle Ages. The opening sentence strikes the keynote: "Universities, like cathedrals and parliaments, are a product of the Middle Ages." The first chapter on "The Earliest Universities" gives in brief compass a good account of the early history of institutions of learning. "The occasion for the rise of universities was a great revival of learning, . . . which historians now call the renaissance of the twelfth century" (p. 7). This continuity does not lie in buildings or in any particular architectural type, nor in "academic form and ceremony." It is rather to be found in its institutions; and "no substitute has been found for the university—its main business, the training of scholars and the maintenance of the tradition of learning and investigation." Here, as elsewhere, the author helps, in the words of a recent statement in the *Proceedings of the American Philological Association* for 1922, to dispel the "sentimental and distorted idea of the medieval mind which began in the eighteenth century." Since (to quote the same *Proceedings*) "the more important middle division of man's intellectual history is still obscured by paradox and misunderstanding as well as by ignorance," Dean Haskins' words are thrice welcome.

"The Mediæval Professor" (Chapter II) is as illuminating as entertaining, and reveals not a little original research (cf. *e. g.*, p. 74). Here, too, the author does not fail to remind the present age of the lessons to be learned from the past. "Graduation in arts was the common preparation for professional study. . . . A sound tradition, to which the American world has given too little attention." Mention is made (p. 46) that there were fewer students of theology in the Middle Ages than commonly thought. The discussion of "academic freedom" and "the social position and self-respect of professors" (pp. 68 ff.) is enlightening and—to some readers—will be disillusioning: Freedom existed in the teaching of grammar, medicine and mathematics, but not in philosophy and theology.

In the final chapter, "The Mediæval Student," we are informed that it is as yet impossible to give an adequate treatment of the subject until "conditions at each university shall have been studied

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

chronologically." Nevertheless, the numerous citations from letters, etc., are highly illuminating. Interesting is the following: "By far the largest element in the correspondence . . . consists of requests for money" (p. 103). Exceptionally valuable and up-to-date (see bibliography) is the discussion of the Goliardi and their poetry. The chapter closes with a fitting reminder that the mediæval student, in his relations to life and learning, "resembled his modern successor far more than is supposed."

Not the least important feature of the volume is the bibliography; it is gratifying to see that several American students, not all of whom are specialists in the field of history, have in recent years made contributions to the subject. The book is particularly attractive to the eye.

E. P. K.

Schriften der Kleist-Gesellschaft, Band 2: Jahrbuch 1922. Hrsg. von Georg Minde-Pouet und Julius Petersen (Berlin, Weidmann, 1923). The ranks of the German societies devoted to the study of individual poets—I need mention only Shakespeare, Goethe, and Grillparzer—have recently been increased by a *Kleist-Gesellschaft* at Frankfort on the Oder, whose second Year-Book has just appeared. It is a valuable and most welcome contribution to the literature on Kleist, of which only a brief outline can here be given. Eugen Kühnemann's essay on "Kleist und Kant" culminates in an interpretation of *Der Prinz von Homburg* from the point of view of Kant's influence on Kleist. Helmuth Rogge brings forward unpublished letters of Fouqué and Hitzig, which shed new light on the publication of the *Abendblätter*, on *Der Prinz von Homburg,* and on Kleist's last days. Friedrich Michael traces the influence of Goethe's Amtmann, in *Hermann und Dorothea,* upon Kleist's Richter Adam in *Der zerbrochene Krug.* Eduard Berend shows that Jean Paul's allusion to a new genius referred to Kleist's *Familie Schroffenstein.* Wilhelm Waetzoldt and others give their views on the question as to whether the mask discovered a few years ago at Düsseldorf is that of Kleist, living or dead. Finally there are synopses of as yet unpublished articles on Kleist, together with a comprehensive bibliography for the year 1922, by Georg Minde-Pouet. This bibliography alone, which covers more than 50 pages, will make the *Jahrbuch* indispensable to every library and to every serious student of Kleist.

The membership-fee is $1 per year, which the Emergency Society for German and Austrian Science and Art (Prof. F. W. J. Heuser, Columbia Univ., Sec.) is ready to accept and transmit.

W. K.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

RECENT PUBLICATIONS

ENGLISH

Agate, James.—The Contemporary Theatre, 1923. *London:* Leonard Parsons, 1924. 313 pp. 7s. 6d.

Barnouw, A. J.—Echoes of the Pilgrim Fathers' Speech. [*Mededeelingen der koninklijke Akademie van Wetenschappen*, Afdeeling Letterkunde, Deel 55, Serie A. No. 6]. *Amsterdam:* 1923.

Benson, A. C.—Memories and Friends. *London:* Murray, 1924. 338 pp. 16s.

Brandl, Alois.—Zur Psychologie des Dichtens bei Burns. *Berlin:* de Gruyter, 1923. [Aus: Sitzungsberichte d. preuss. Akad. d. Wiss. Philos.-hist. Kl. 21, 1923.]

Bridges, Sir Robert.—The Chilswell Book of English Poetry. *London:* Longmans, Green and Co., 1924. 6s. 6d.

Chew, Samuel C.—Byron in England. *New York:* Charles Scribner's Sons 1924, $4.50.

Digeon, A.—Les Romans de Fielding. Diss. *Paris:* Presses universitaires, 1923. 312 pp.

—— Le Texte des Romans de Fielding. Diss. *Paris:* Presses universitaires, 1923. 104 pp.

Drinkwater, John.—Select Poems of Lord de Tabley. *London:* Milford, 1924. 204 pp.

—— The Outline of Literature. [Volume III]. *New York:* G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1924.

Fontainas, André.—Percy Bysshe Shelley: Odes, Poèmes, et Fragments Lyriques Choisis. [Traduction et Introduction.] *Paris:* Classiques Garnier, 1924. 5 f.

Grew, Sydney.—A Book on English Prosody. *London:* Grant Richards, 1924. 6s.

Hall, Joseph.—Layamon's Brut. (Selections). *New York:* Oxford University Press, 1924. $2.20.

Harries, Frederick J.—The Welsh Elizabethans. *Pontypridd:* Glamorgan County Times, 1924. 7s. 6d.

Ker, W. P.—Essays and Studies by Members of The English Association. Volume IX. *New York:* Oxford University Press, 1924.

Killen, Alice M.—Le Roman Terrifiant, ou Roman noir de Walpole et Radcliffe. *Paris:* E. Champion, 1924.

Kuhl, Ernest P.—Chaucer and Aldgate. [Reprinted from *PLMA.*, XXXIX.]

Kühnemund, Richard.—Die Rolle des Zufalls in Shakespeares Meistertragödien. *Halle a. S.:* Niemeyer, 1923. [Diss., Göttingen.]

Law, Alice.—Patrick Branwell Brontë. *London:* A. M. Philpot. 192 pp. 6 s.

Lovett, Robt. Morss.—Thackeray's "The History of Pendennis," with an introduction. [The Modern Student's Library.] 2 vols. *New York:* Charles Scribner's Sons, 1917. $1.50.

Manchon, J.—Le Slang. Lexique de l'Anglais familier et vulgaire. *Paris:* Payot, 1924. Fr. 12.

Manrois, Andre. — Ariel—The Life of Shelley, translated by Ella D'Arcy. *New York:* D. Appleton Co., 1924.

Maynard, Theodore.—Our Best Poets. *London:* Brentano's, 1924.

Mégroz, R. L.—Walter de la Mare: A Biographical and Critical Study. *London:* Hodder and Stoughton, 1924. 7s. 6d.

Moffatt, James H. and Barroll, J. Leeds. Handbook of English. *New York:* Charles Scribner's Sons, 1924. $ .60.

Müller, K.—Das Naturgefühl bei Thomas Hardy. Dissertation, *Jena:* 1924.

Nicolson, Marjorie H.—Selected Poems of Alfred, Lord Tennyson. *Boston:* Houghton Mifflin Co., 1924. $ .90.

O'Rahilly, Cecile.—Ireland and Wales. *London:* Longmans, 1924. 154 pp. 7s. 6d.

Partridge, Eric.—Eighteenth Century Romantic Poetry. *Paris:* E. Champion, 1924.

Phelps, Wm. Lyon.—Selected Stories from Kipling. *New York:* Doubleday, Page and Company, 1924. $1.25.

Root, Robert K. and Russell, Henry N.—A Planetary Date for Chaucer's *Troilus*. [Reprinted from *PMLA.*, XXXIX.]

Schnapp, L.—Lord Byron im Spiegel der deutschen Dichtung. Dissertation, *Münster:* 1924.

Shanks, Edw.—Bernard Shaw.—*London:* Nisbet, 1924. 128 pp. 2s.

Shelly, Percy Van Dyke.—Essays by William Hazlitt. [The Modern Students Library.] *New York:* Charles Scribner's Sons, 1924. $1.00.

Symon, J. D.—Byron in Perspective. *London:* Martin Secker, 1924. 12s. 6d.

Wallace, R. S. and Hansen, Alma.—Holinshed's Chronicle: Richard II, Henry IV, and Henry V. *New York:* Oxford University Press, 1923. $1.20.

Wright, Joseph and Wright, Elizabeth Mary.—An Elementary Middle English Grammar. *New York:* Oxford University Press, 1923. $2.35.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

GERMAN

Bohnenblust, Gottfried.—Goethe und Pestalozzi. Vortrag. *Bern u. Leipzig:* E. Bircher [1923]. 23 pp.

Erdmann, Veronika.—Hölderlins ästhetische Theorie im Zusammenhang seiner Weltanschauung. [Jenaer germanist. Forschungen, 2.] vii + 96 pp. M. 1.00.

Grillparzer, Franz.—Weh' dem, der lügt! Lustspiel in fünf Aufzügen. Ed. by Gilbert Waterhouse. *New York:* Longmans, Green & Co., 1923. xlv + 121 pp. $1.35.

Jahrbuch der Grillparzer-Gesellschaft. Hrsg. von Karl Glossy. Jgg. 27. *Wien:* Amalthea-Verlag, 1924. vii + 140 pp.

Jahresbericht über die Erscheinungen auf dem Gebiete der germanischen Philologie. N. F. Bd. 1. Bibliographie 1921. *Berlin:* de Gruyter & Co., 1924. viii + 165 pp. M. 9.

Jahresbericht über die wissenschaftlichen Erscheinungen auf dem Gebiete der neueren deutschen Literatur. Bd. 1. Bibliographie, 1921. *Berlin:* de Gruyter & Co., 1924. xi + 125 pp. M. 8.

Jellinek, M. H.—Otfrids grammatische und metrische Bemerkungen [S.-A. aus Festschrift für Konrad Zwierzina]. *Graz u. Leipzig:* Leuschner & Lubensky, 1924. 16 pp. M. 0.80.

Kirk, Arthur.—An Introduction to the historical Study of New High German. *New York:* Longmans, Green & Co., 1923. vi + 85 pp. $2.00.

Kraus, C. von.—Zu Walthers Elegie ($124,_1$-$125,_{10}$). [S.-A. aus Festschrift für Konrad Zwierzina]. *Graz u. Leipzig:* Leuschner & Lubensky, 1924. 13 pp. M. 0.80.

Muschg, Walter.—Kleist. *Zürich:* Verlag Seldwyla, 1923. 316 pp. M. 7.

Seuffert, Bernhard.—Goethes Theater-Roman. Festtagsgruss an Konrad Zwierzina. *Graz u. Leipzig:* Leuschner & Lubensky, 1924. 44 pp. M. 1.20.

Singer, S.—Ruodlieb. [S.-A. aus Festschrift für Konrad Zwierzina]. *Graz u. Leipzig:* Leuschner & Lubensky, 1924. 23 pp. M. 0.80.

Spaarnay, H. — Verschmelzung legendarischer und weltlicher Motive in der Poesie des Mittelalters. *Groningen:* P. Noordhoff, 1923. xv + 155 pp. Fl. 3.25.

Von deutscher Art und Kunst. Edited by Edna Purdie. *New York:* Oxford Univ. Press, 1924. 196 pp. $1.70.

Wolff, Ludwig. — Der Gottfried von Strassburg zugeschriebene Marienpreis und Lobgesang auf Christus. Untersuchungen und Text. [Jenaer german. Forsch. 4.]. *Jena:* Frommann, 1924. v + 136 pp. M. 6.

FRENCH

Abensour, L.—La Femme et le féminisme avant la Révolution. Diss. *Paris:* Leroux. 1923. xxii + 477 pp.

Adam le Bossu.—Le Jeu de la Feuillée et le Jeu de Robin et Marion, trad. en fr. mod. par E. Langlois. *Paris:* Boccard, 1923. xxxi + 159 pp.

Arvin, N. C. — Eugène Scribe and the French Theatre. *Cambridge:* Harvard Press, 1924. x + 268 pp.

Augier, E.—Maître Guérin, ed. by C. F. Zeek. *New York:* Holt, 1924. xix + 272 pp.

Bibliography of publications of H. A. Rennert, by his colleagues. *Philadelphia:* 1924. 20 pp.

Brieux.—La Robe rouge, ed. by L. Cardon. *New York:* Holt, 1924. xxxiv + 245 pp.

Brunot, F.—Histoire de la langue fr. IV La Langue classique (1660-1775). *Paris:* Colin, 1924. 550 pp.

Busson, H.—Les sources et le développement du rationalisme dans la litt. fr. de la Renaissance (1533-1601). *Paris:* Letouzey, 1922. xvii + 685 pp.

Catalogue général des livres impr. de la Bibliothèque nationale. T. 78. Jesaja-Joset. *Paris:* Impr. nationale, 1924.

Chaytor, H. J.—Seven Short Stories by Fr. Authors. *Cambridge:* Univ. Press, 1923. xii + 210 pp.

Clément and Macirone.—Voici la France! *Boston:* Heath, 1924. viii + 287 pp.

Corrozet, G.—Le Compte du rossignol. Introd. par F. Gohin. *Paris:* Garnier. 1924. 84 pp. Fr. 16.

Daudet, A.—Pages inédites de critique dramatiques. *Paris:* Flammarion, 1924. 357 pp. Fr. 8.

—— Le Nabab, ed. with vocab. by B. W. Wells. *New York:* Ginn, 1924. xxvi + 313 pp.

Fernessole, Abbé P.—Les Origines litt. de L. Veuillot (1813-1843). Diss. *Paris:* de Gigord, 1923. 452 pp.

—— Bio-bibliographie de la jeunesse de L. Veuillot. Diss. *Paris:* de Gigord, 1923. 167 pp.

Holzwarth and Price.—Beginners' French. *Boston:* Heath, 1924. xxiii + 374 pp. $1.56.

Hubert, R.—Les Sciences sociales dans l'Encyclopédie. Diss. *Paris:* Alcan, 1923. 368 pp.

Jacoubet, H.—Le Comte de Tressan et les origines du genre troubadour. Diss. *Paris:* Presses universitaires, 1923. xxiv + 440 pp.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

Kolovrat, G. de.—Etude sur la vocalisation de la consonne *l* dans les langs. roms. and Supplements. Diss. *Paris:* Jouve and *Nice:* Impr. Idéale, 1923. 307 and 62 pp.

—— L'inversion du complément direct et l'accent oratoire dans le Roman de Troie. Paris diss. *Nice:* Impr. Idéale, 1923. 151 pp.

Laboulaye.—Contes bleus, ed. by G. E. Wisewell. *Boston:* Allyn & Bacon, 1924. xvi + 237 pp.

Laporte, J.—La Doctrine de la grâce chez Arnauld. Diss. *Paris:* Presses universitaires, 1922. lii + 456 pp.

—— Saint-Cyran. Diss. *Paris:* Presses universitaires, 1922. 132 pp.

Lespinasse, Mlle de.—Lettres. Préface de H. Frichet. *Paris:* France-Edition, 1924. 192 pp. Fr. 2.50.

Le Poittevin, A.—Une promenade de Bélial, ed. by R. Descharmes. *Paris:* Presses fr., 1924. xcii + 234 pp. (Bibl. romantique).

Marion, S.—Relations des voyageurs frs. en Nouvelle France au XVIIme s. Diss. *Paris:* Presses universitaires, 1923. 276 pp.

Renaut, E.—Du Commerce, lectures commerciales. *New York:* Oxford Press, 1924. 190 pp. $1.70.

Roserot de Melin, J.—Antonio Caracciolo, évêque de Troyes (1515?-1570). Diss. *Paris:* Letouzey, 1923. xv + 449 pp.

Stendhal.—Journal, éd. par Debraye et Royer, xli + 448 pp. Le rouge et le noir, éd. par Marzan et Bourget, 2 vols., lxxxi + 446 + 621 pp. Vie de Rossini suivie des Notes d'un dilettante, éd. par H. Prunières, 2 vols. lx + 380 + 497 pp. *Paris:* Champion, 1923.

ITALIAN

Alfieri, Vittorio.—Mirra. Interpretata da A. Momigliano, con un saggio introduttivo. *Firenze:* Vallecchi, 1923. 129 pp. L. 5. (Classici italiani commentati.)

—— Vita di — da Asti, scritta da esso. *Firenze:* F. Le Monnier, 1923. 334 pp. L. 5. (Nuova biblioteca nazionale.)

Alighieri, Dante.—La Divina Commèdia, corredata dei segni della pronunzia e di nuovi spediènti utili all'evidènza, ai raffronti, alle ricerche, alla memorazione, da L. Polacco. Sèsta edizione, interamente riveduta e rinnovata nel tèsto da G. Vandelli. *Milano:* Hoepli, 1924. xxxvi + 403 pp. L. 8.50. (Biblioteca classica hoepliana.)

Caro, Annibal.—Le più belle pagine scelte da F. Pastonchi. *Milano:* Treves, 1923. iv + 332 pp. (Le più belle pagine degli scrittori italiani scelte da scrittori viventi, no. 12.)

Della Torre, R.—La porta di san Pietro. Briciole dantesche. *Cividale:* G. Fulvio, 1923. 46 pp.

Fattorello, F.—A. Fogazzaro: profilo. *Udine:* Libreria Carducci ed., 1923. 47 pp. L. 3.50. (Poeti e scrittori del XIX secolo.)

—— M. D'Azeglio: profilo. *Udine:* Libr. Carducci ed., 1923. 44 pp. L. 3.50. (Poeti e scrittori del XIX secolo.)

Frisoni, C.—Una miljore fonografia della lingua italiana. Nozioni, osservazioni e proposte. *Isola Liri* (*Caserta*): Stab. tipografico, 1923. xx + 70 pp. L. 5.

Galiani, F.—Del dialetto napoletano. Con introduzione e note di F. Nicolini. *Napoli:* R. Ricciardi, 1923. lv + 318 pp. L. 15. (Biblioteca napoletana di storia, letteratura ed arte.)

Gardner, E. G.—Tommaso Campanella and his Poetry. *New York:* Oxford University Press, 1923. 24 pp. 70 cts. (The Taylorian Lecture, 1923.)

Giusti, D.—Vita e opere dell' abate Giacinto Gimma. *Bari:* Fratelli Fusco, 1923. 109 pp. L. 12.

Lamborizio, P.—Vittorio Alfieri, Ugo Foscolo e Giosuè Carducci classici e patrioti. Pensieri di critica. *Alessandria:* Tip. Cooperativa, 1923. 36 pp. L. 4.

Lipparini, G. — Passeggiate. *Firenze:* Vallecchi, 1923. 228 pp. L. 6.

Mancinelli, N.—Horae subsicivae (Un'analogia tra il pessimismo di Leopardi e quello d'Amleto. Su di un luogo di Svetonio. La lirica amorosa di Guittone d'Arezzo.) *Roma:* C. Colombo, 1923. 19 pp.

Manzoni intimo. Vol. I e II. a cura di M. Scherillo, e vol. III, a cura di G. Gallavresi, nel centenario dei Promessi Sposi e cinquantesimo della morte di Alessandro Manzoni. *Milano:* Hoepli, 1923. 3 vols., xviii + 228; ix + 280; xxiv + 215 pp. L. 31.50.

Marino, G. B.—Idillii favolosi. Introduzione e note di G. Balsamo-Crivelli. *Torino:* Unione tipografico-editrice, 1923. xxi + 259 pp. L. 10. (Collezione di classici italiani con note, XXXIX.)

Massart, E.—Una postilla a Giacomo Leopardi. *Piombino:* Tip. La Perseveranza, 1923. 20 pp.

Mele, D.—Il Parnaso sardo, ordinato ed illustrato da P. Meloni Satta. *Cagliari:* G. Ledda, 1923. 83 pp. L. 4.

Nencioni, E.—Impressioni e rimembranze, con pensieri su lui, di Pasquale Villari, Augusto Franchetti, Matilde Serao, Guido Biagi. *Firenze:* F. Le Monnier, 1923. 230 pp.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

Parise-Caccavari, G.—Berardino Rota e il suo canzoniere. *Monteleone:* G. Froggio, 1923. 91 pp.

Petrarca, F.—Epistolae selectae, edited by A. F. Johnson. *New York:* Oxford University Press, 1923. 286 pp. $2.85.

Porta, A.—Byronismo italiano: Parte I. *Milano:* L. F. Cogliati, 1923. 336 pp. L. 18.

Salmoria, G.—I processi e le condanne di Dante. Lezione alla università popolare di Siena. *Castelfiorentino:* Giovannelli e Carpitelli, 1923. 27 pp.

Setchanove, L. J.—Jean-Baptiste Niccolini et l'influence étrangère dans son oeuvre dramatique. Thèse présentée pour le doctorat de l'université. *Paris:* H. d'Arthez, 1923. 221 pp. (Faculté des lettres de l'Université de Paris.)

Tortoreto, A.—Alessandro Manzoni, uomo e scrittore. Discorso commemorativo detto il 19 aprile 1923 alla scuola tecnico-letteraria femminile di Milano, ricorrendo il 50° anniversario della morte. *Milano:* Scuola tip. Artigianelli, 1923. 8 pp. L. 1.

Wessely, J. E.—Italian and English Dictionary. Edited by F. H. T. Gray. *New York:* Dutton (1923). 470 pp. 70 cts.

SPANISH

Alarcón, P. A. de.—El Final de Norma. Edited with notes and vocabulary by L. P. Brown. *Boston:* Ginn and Co., 1924. xi + 278 pp. $1.00.

Cabal, C.—Del folklore de Asturias. Cuentos leyendas y tradiciones. *Madrid:* Imp. de la Edit. "Voluntad," 1923. xviii + 241 pp. 4 pes.

Cejador y Frauca, J.—La verdadera poesía castellana. Floresta de la antigua lírica popular, recogida y estudiada por —. Tomo IV. *Madrid:* Tip. de la "Revista de Archivos," 1923. 320 pp. 7.50 pes.

Cervantes Saavedra, M. de.—Viaje del Parnaso. Edición publicada por R. Schevill y A. Bonilla. *Madrid:* Gráficas Reunidas, 1924. xii + 208 pp. 6 pes. (Obras completas.)

——Novelas y teatro. Selección hecha por J. Sela. *Madrid:* Tip. de la "Revista de Archivos," 1922. 286 pp. 3.50 pes. (Biblioteca Literaria del Estudiante, XXI.)

Espronceda, J. de.—Obras poéticas. Colección de todas las conocidas hasta el día, dirigida y precedida de la biografía del autor, por J. Cascales Muñoz. *Madrid:* Sucesores de Rivadeneyra, 1923. 676 pp. 6 pes.

Farinelli, A.—Guillaume de Humboldt et l'Espagne. Avec une esquisse sur Goethe et l'Espagne. *Torino:* Fratelli Bocca, 1924. 366 pp. L. 28. (Letterature moderne, VII.)

García Villada, Z.—Paleografía española, con una introducción sobre la paleografía latina. I: Texto. II: Album. *Madrid:* Blass y Cía., 1923. vii + 371 pp. 35 pes. (Publicaciones de la "Revista de Filología Española," VI.)

Hatzfeld, H.—Spanische Literatur. *München:* M. Hueber, 1923. 146 pp. (Führer durch die literarischen Meisterwerke der Romanen, II.)

Krappe, A. H.—The Legend of Rodrick, Last of the Visigoth Kings and the Ermanarich Cycle. *Heidelberg:* C. Winter, 1923. 64 pp.

Madariaga, S. de.—Semblanzas literarias contemporáneas: Galdós, Ayala, Unamuno, Baroja, Valle-Inclán, Azorín, Miró. *Barcelona:* Edit. Cervantes, 1924. 235 pp. 5 pes.

Piñol, F.—Historietas. *Yonkers-on-Hudson, N. Y.:* World Book Co., 1924. viii + 161 pp. $1.20. (New-World Spanish Series.)

Quevedo Villegas, F. de.—Obras. Colección completa corregida, ordenada e ilustrada por A. Fernández-Guerra y Orbe. Tomo I. *Madrid:* Sucesores de Hernando, 1923. cxxxv + 551 pp. 10 pes. (Biblioteca de Autores Españoles.)

Revilla Marcos, A.—José María Gabriel y Galán. Su vida y sus obras. Estudio crítico. Prólogo de M. de Unamuno. *Madrid:* Sucesores de Rivadeneyra, 1923. 210 pp. 4 pes.

Rojas, R.—La literatura argentina. Ensayo filosófico sobre la evolución de la cultura en el Plata. IV: Los modernos. *Buenos Aires:* Imp. "Coni," 1922. [illegible] + 696 pp.

Sánchez, Pérez, J. A.—Leyendas españolas. With introduction, notes, exercises and vocabulary by Fannie Malone. *Boston:* Allyn and Bacon, 1924. xi + 182 pp. 80 cts.

Villena, Enrique de.—Arte de trovar. Edición, prólogo y notas de F. J. Sánchez Cantón. *Madrid:* Imp. Clásica Española, 1923. 98 pp. 3 pes. (Biblioteca Española de divulgación científica, II.)

Whitman, F. W., and Aguilera, F.—A Course in Spanish Composition. *New York:* Longmans, Green & Co., 1924. viii + 253 pp. $1.48.

Wilkins, L. A.—Antología de cuentos americanos. Edited with exercises, notes, and vocabulary, by —. With a critical introduction by F. de Onís. *Boston:* D. C. Heath and Co., 1924. xxiii + 287 pp. $1.04.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES

VOLUME XXXIX NOVEMBER, 1924 NUMBER 7

THE APPARITIONS IN *MACBETH*

PART II

Our study of the first three apparitions, in an earlier paper (*Modern Language Notes,* Vol. XXXIX, p. 345), led to the view that all these alike were prophetic threats at Macbeth's kingship, rather than his life, though the Macduff of the first two was later to take his life. The third, Malcolm, as the "Child Crowned," was a challenge both to his kingship and to his succession. The fourth, "A show of eight Kings, and Banquo last," was likewise a challenge to Macbeth's kingship, but, especially, as we shall see later, was a direct challenge to the succession.

This fourth and last apparition was probably the most significant and the most appalling of the lot. It was the only one of the four for which there was no hint in Holinshed, and which, so far as we now know, was entirely of Shakespeare's own contriving. As the dramatist's own addition to the series of apparitions, it was apparently intended to enforce the new conception of the character and of the plot that Shakespeare imposed upon the chronicle. This feature will be seen to constitute the difference between Shakespeare's and Holinshed's conception of the hero, and will raise the Macbeth of the dramatist to a higher level of tragic passion than that of the chronicler.

The first three apparitions had very greatly disturbed Macbeth, but had also given him immediate consolation in the security to his own life seemingly promised him by the second and third. Not content, however, to be assured, as he thought, of his own safety, he was in great anxiety about the succession to the throne. Accordingly, in spite of previous warning to "Hear his speech, but

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

say thou nought," Macbeth made bold to question the witches about his dearest ambition, saying:

> Yet my heart
> Throbs to know one thing: tell me, if your art
> Can tell so much: shall Banquo's issue ever
> Reign in this kingdom?

Whereupon the witches all said to him, "Seek to know no more." But he would not be denied, and insisted:

> I will be satisfied: deny me this,
> And an eternal curse fall on you! Let me know.

Then the witches produced the fourth apparition, "A show of Eight Kings, the last with a glass in his hand; Banquo's Ghost following."

Macbeth's anxiety about the succession, it is evident, was due to his remembrance of the earlier prophecy of the witches to Banquo, "Thou shalt get kings, though thou be none" (I, III, 67). Even at that time the prophecy greatly disturbed him, for later in the same scene he twice spoke about it to Banquo (II, 85 and 118). Shakespeare apparently wished his audience to understand that this thought had sunk deeply into the mind of Macbeth, and that it greatly worried him. It was, in fact, his greatest anxiety. The apparition, however, was not difficult for him, and for the audience, to interpret, and he at once recognized the line of kings as Banquo's descendants, for, as he said, Banquo himself "points at them as his."

Upton's observation on this fourth apparition contributes little or nothing to the interpretation, and probably for that reason is not quoted by Furness. It is, however, worth quoting as an instance of the failure of critics generally to observe the deep significance of this last apparition. Upton wrote: "And when the kings appear, we have a piece of machinery, that neither the ancients or moderns can exceed. I know nothing any where can parallel it, but that most sublime passage in Virgil, where the great successors of Aeneas pass in review before the hero's eyes." (*Critical Observations on Shakespeare*, 2nd. ed., 1748, p. 39.)

The bearing of this apparition upon the nature of Macbeth's ambition has not been fully understood. The dramatist was apparently trying to make it clear that Macbeth desired not merely to possess the crown for himself, but, more, if possible, to be able to

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

pass it on to his own descendants. He wanted not only to be a king, but even more to found a line of kings. Proud and ambitious, he wished to be the father of kings. As appears later in the play, he thought it scarcely worth while to commit so heinous a crime as the murder of Duncan, if in the end the crown would pass from his line to that of Banquo. This thought is very clearly expressed by Macbeth in his soliloquy following the interview with Banquo in which he invited him to the coronation supper:

> Our fears in Banquo
> Stick deep: and in his royalty of nature
> Reigns that which would be fear'd . . . . .
> . . . . . There is none but he
> Whose being I do fear . . . . .
> . . . . . He chid the sisters
> When first they put the name of king upon me,
> And bade them speak to him; then prophet-like
> They hail'd him father to a line of kings:
> Upon my head they placed a fruitless crown,
> And put a barren sceptre in my gripe,
> Thence to be wrench'd by an unlineal hand,
> No son of mine succeeding. If't be so,
> For Banquo's issue have I filed my mind;
> For them the gracious Duncan have I murder'd;
> Put rancours in the vessel of my peace
> Only for them; and mine eternal jewel
> Given to the common enemy of man,
> To make them kings, the seed of Banquo kings!
>
> (III, I, 49-70)

These lines should make it abundantly clear that Shakespeare wants us to think of Macbeth as having children, and that his ambition is not only to hold the throne for himself, but also to pass it on to his own descendants. Rowe remarks that "Macbeth's anxiety to have the crown descend lineally shows that he then had children" (Quoted, Furness, p. 298). And as Brandes remarks, if he has no children, these lines are meaningless (*William Shakespeare,* p. 430).

Upon this passage Bradley makes the following very pertinent comment: "Obviously he contemplates a son of his succeeding, if only he can get rid of Banquo and Fleance . . . I hope this is clear; and nothing else matters. Lady Macbeth's child (I, VII, 54) may be alive or may be dead. It may even be, or have been,

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

her child by a former husband; though if Shakespeare had followed history in making Macbeth marry a widow (as some writers gravely assume) he would probably have told us so. It may be that Macbeth had many children or that he had none. We cannot say, and it does not concern the play" (*Shakespearean Tragedy*, p. 489).

At the close of the soliloquy referred to Macbeth made the desperate resolve to leave nothing undone to frustrate the succession of Banquo's children, and exclaimed:

> Rather than so, come fate into the list,
> And champion me to the utterance [uttermost].

With these thoughts in his mind, he gave to the murderers who immediately entered particular instructions to be sure to dispatch Fleance with his father, saying,

> and with him—
> To leave no rubs nor botches in the work—
> Fleance his son, that keeps him company,
> Whose absence is no less material to me
> Than is his father's, must embrace the fate
> Of that dark hour.
>
> (III, I, 133-138)

How deeply this thought had taken hold of Macbeth may be seen in his bitter disappointment and almost paralysis of fear when the murderers later reported that Fleance had escaped them:

> Then comes my fit again: I had else been perfect,
> Whole as the marble, founded as the rock,
> As broad and general as the casing air:
> But now I am cabin'd, cribb'd, confined, bound in
> To saucy doubts and fears.
>
> (III, IV, 21-25)

The fact that the play does not mention any children of Macbeth, nor refer directly to any, does not signify. It is apparent that the dramatist wishes us to understand that Lord and Lady Macbeth had children, or at least one child, for he early in the play had Lady Macbeth say,

> I have given suck and know
> How tender 'tis to love the babe that milks me.
>
> (I, VII, 54-5)

Neither does Holinshed mention any child of Macbeth. But other

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

chroniclers speak of a step-son (son of Lady Macbeth by a former husband), or of a son, who survived him and continued the struggle against his enemies. (Cf. Furness, p. 394, and Chambers, p. 14.) And this Shakespeare added to the tragic motive found in Holinshed. The speech of Macduff's that "He has no children" (IV, III, 216), no doubt refers not to Macbeth, but to Malcolm, who is yet a young man. (Cf. Note in Bradley, pp. 489-492. Of this opinion are Ritson, Malone, Rowe, Rolfe, Herford, Hudson, Chambers, Verity, Schelling, etc.)

In the same scene in which Lady Macbeth referred to her child, Macbeth spoke to her in words that would scarcely be appropriate to a childless woman. After she had screwed up his courage to the sticking-place, he was so impressed with her almost masculine strength that he spoke to her in words that seem to imply that she had at least a son:

> Bring forth men-children only;
> For thy undaunted mettle should compose
> Nothing but males. (I, VII, 72-4)

We may take it, then, that Macbeth's question to the witches after the third apparition, in which he sought to know whether or not the crown would pass to Banquo's descendants, was a revelation of his deep anxiety on this subject. The fourth apparition, which, as we saw, was of the dramatist's own contriving, came as an answer to Macbeth's inquiry, and is Shakespeare's attempt to bring before his audience the full dimensions of Macbeth's ambition. This, as the dramatist wishes us to understand it, included not only the kingship for himself, but also for his children after him. It should be clear, then, that Macbeth, like Caesar, was anxious to be the father to a line of kings. It is thus the dramatist enlarged the ambition of Macbeth, as he found it in Holinshed.

This phase of Macbeth's ambition may account for his growing cruelty and desperation, and for the fact that he endeavored to destroy Macduff's entire family, not only the wife but also the children, as he had tried to destroy Banquo and his family. His plans toward Macduff he expressed in these words:

> The castle of Macduff I will surprise;
> Seize upon Fife; give to the edge o' the sword
> His wife, his babes, and all unfortunate souls
> That trace him in his line. (IV, I, 150-3)

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

He almost "out-Herods Herod" in his desperate efforts to destroy all children who might possibly be in the way of aspiring to the crown. This he thought necessary in view of the fact that Macduff was rapidly developing into the leadership of the rebellion against him, and threatened to deprive him of his crown, and possibly to assume it himself. Therefore, to "make assurance doubly sure" he determined to blot out not only Macduff himself, but his entire family.

It is necessary, then, if we would understand Macbeth, to keep in mind this twofold and far-reaching nature of his wicked ambition. He wishes to be himself a king, and to found a line of kings. The apparitions showed, however, that he was to be deprived of his kingship, and that, moreover, no son of his should succeed him. His attainment of the kingship had not satisfied his ambition, and the apparitions warned him that his was to be "a fruitless crown." Shakespeare has thus enlarged upon and made more tragic the brutal ambition of Macbeth as he found it in Holinshed. It is no longer merely the selfish ambition to occupy the throne of Scotland himself, but, the more refined, though no less criminal ambition to enlarge the heritage of his children after him. All four apparitions, then, by prophesying symbolically the loss of Macbeth's crown and the defeat of his ambition to found a line of kings, develop very dramatically the true tragic nature of Macbeth's great passion.

A. W. Crawford.

University of Manitoba.

GRIMALD'S TRANSLATIONS FROM BEZA

Of Nicholas Grimald, one of the principal contributors to Tottel's miscellany of *Songes and Sonettes* (1557), Courthope has written:[1] "In him the genius of the epigrammatist predominates, and all his poetical efforts are devoted to make the freshly-tuned language an instrument for producing terse and pregnant effects of expression." As an illustration of this observation Courthope quotes Grimald's "Description of Vertue" from *Songes and Son-*

[1] *History of English Poetry,* II, 149.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

ettes. Again, he reprints in full Grimald's elegy entitled, "The louer asketh pardon of his dere, for fleeyng from her," introducing it with these words: "In the following curiously conceited lines we observe the first symptoms of a new treatment of the subject of love. The pedantry and learned allusion which characterize them are perhaps the earliest notes in English poetry of that manner which culminated in the 'metaphysical' style of Cowley and his contemporaries."

Had Courthope chanced to examine closely Timothe Kendall's *Flowers of Epigrammes* (1577), he might have been surprised to find Grimald's "Description of Vertue" there reprinted as a translation from Theodorus Beza; and had he, following this clue, compared the extant English poems of Grimald with Beza's early Latin ones, he would have found that not only the two he reprints but also some eight or nine others of the English poet's contributions are close translations from the work of the learned French reformer.

In 1548 Theodore de Bèze, better known by his Latinized name of Theodorus Beza, had published his *Poemata Juvenilia.* This volume contained, after the manner of many such collections in the sixteenth century, Latin elegies, *sylvae,* epitaphs, and epigrams. Originally published under the pseudonym of Deodatus Seba, and in part regretted by their author because of their looseness, a large number of these juvenile poems were suppressed during Beza's lifetime. In the authorized *Theodori Bezae Vezelii Poemata Varia* (Geneva, 1597), a careful selection is included, together with poems written after 1548. The *Juvenilia* were reprinted in full, however, shortly after Beza's death, in Gruter's *Delitiae Poetarum Gallorum* (1609); and again, together with similar collections by Muretus and Secundus, in 1757 and 1779.

Grimald had access, of course, to the first edition of the *Juvenilia.* His translations, as they appeared in Tottel's *Songes and Sonettes,* are listed below:[2]

(1). Grimald: The louer to his dear, of his exceding loue (96), 46 lines, beginning,

Phebe twise took her horns, twise layd them by,
I, all the while, on thee could set no yie.

[2] Figures in parentheses are page references: for Grimald, to Arber's reprint (1895) of *Songes and Sonnettes;* for Beza, to *Theodori Bezae Vezelii Poemata,* Lugduni, 1757.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

Beza: Elegia III (23), 46 lines beginning,

Cornua bis posuit, bis cepit cornua Phoebe;
  Nec tamen es tanto tempore visa mihi.

(2). Grimald: The louer asketh pardon of his dere, for fleeyng from her (98), 36 lines, beginning,

Louers men warn the corps beloued to flee,
From the blinde fire in case they would liue free.
Ay mee, how oft haue I fled thee, my Day?

Beza: Elegia V (27), 40 lines, beginning,

Quisquis amas (aiūt cūcti) fugi corpus amatū
  Viuere si coeco liber ab igne cupis.
Hei mihi, te quoties fugi, mea Candida! fugi.

(3). Grimald: N. Vincent to G. Blackwood, agaynst wedding (99), 20 lines, beginning,

Sythe, Blackwood, you haue mynde to wed a wife:
I pray you, tell, wherefore you like that life.

Beza: Ponticus Cornelio, de Uxore non Ducenda (115), 20 lines, beginning,

Cum velis uxorem, Corneli, ducere: quaero
  Conjugium placeat qua ratione tibi?

(4). Grimald: G. Blackwood to N. Vincent, with weddyng (99), 18 lines, beginning,

Sythe, Vincent, I haue minde to wed a wife:
You bid me tell, wherfore I like that life.

Beza: Cornelius Pontico, de Uxore ducenda (116), 18 lines, beginning,

Uxorem cupiam cum ducere, Pontice, quaeris
  Conjugium placeat qua ratione mihi?

(5). Grimald: Description of Vertue (108).

What one art thou, thus in torn weed yclad?
Vertue, in price whom auncient sages had.
Why, poorely rayd? For fadyng goodes past care.
Why doublefaced? I marke eche fortunes fare.
This bridle, what? Mindes rages to restrain.
Tooles why beare you: I loue to take great pain.
Why, winges? I teach aboue the starres to flye.
Why tread you death? I onely cannot dye.

Beza: Descriptio Virtutis (80).

Quaenam tam lacero vestita incedis amictu?
  Virtus antiquis nobilitata Sophis.
Cur vestis tam vilis? Opes contemno caducas.

Digitized by Google

Original from
UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

Cur gemina est facies? Tempus utrumque noto.
Quid docet hoc frenum? Mentis cohibere furores.
Rastros cur gestas? Res mihi grata labor.
Cur volucris? Doceo tandem super astra volare.
Cur tibi mors premitur? Nescio sola mori.

(6). Grimald: Prayse of measurekepyng (108), 26 lines, beginning,

The auncient time commended, not for nought,
The mean: what better thing can ther be sought?

Beza: In Mediocritatis Laudem, Elegia II (22), 26 lines, beginning,

Non frustra solita est mediū laudare vetustas.
Nam nil laudari dignius orbis habet.

(7). Grimald: An other, of the same knightes death (112).[3]

For Wilford wept first men, then ayr also,
For Wilford felt the waters wayfull wo.
The men so wept: that bookes, abrode which bee,
Of moornyng meeters full a man may see.
So wayld the ayr: that, clowds consumde, remayned
No dropes, but drouth the parched erth sustayned.
So greeted floods: that, where ther rode before
A ship, a car may go safe on the shore.
Left were nomo, but heauen, and erth, to make,
Throughout the world, this greef his rigor take.
But sins the heauen this Wilfords goste dothe keep,
The earth, his corps: saye mee, why shold they weep?

Beza: Ejusdem (47).[4]

Budaeum flevere homines, ploravit et aër;
Budaeus gelidis est quoque fletus aquis.
Sic flevere homines, ut plena volumina moestis
Carminibus quivis Bibliopola terat.
Sic aër luxit, consumptis undique nimbis,
Ut jam quas plueret non reperiret aquas.
Flumina sic flerunt, ut qua modo navis abibat,
Currat inoffensis sicca quadriga rotis.
Restabant caelum et tellus, communis ut omni,
Quamlibet immenso, moeror in orbe foret:
Sed cum caelum animam Budaei, terra cadaver
Possideat, quaeso, qua ratione fleant?

[3] The second of his two epitaphs upon Sir James Wilford (d. 1550).

[4] The third of his three epitaphs upon Guillaume Budé (d. 1540). Another English rendering of this epitaph may be seen in Kendall's *Flowers of Epigrammes* (1577).

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

(8). Grimald: Vpon the sayd lord Mautrauers death (119).

Mee thought, of late when lord Mautrauers dyed,
Our common weal, thus, by her self shee cryed:
Oft haue I wept for mine, so layd a sleep,
Yet neuer had I iuster cause to weep.

Beza: D. Io. Valentis, Regia consiliis (45).

Extincto nuper Respublica moesta Valente,
  Visa mihi secum sic gemebunda queri:
Saepe alios flevi, dum sic raperentur, alumnos:
  Causa tamen nunquam justior ulla fuit.

(9). Grimald: Marcus Tullius Ciceroes death (123), 88 lines, beginning,

Therefore, when restlesse rage of wynde, and waue
Hee saw: By fates, alas calld for (quod hee)
Is haplesse Cicero: sayl on, shape course
To the next shore, and bryng me to my death.

Beza: Mors Ciceronis, ex Lib. historiarum Livii CXX. et Vitis Plutarch, et Valer. Max., Sylva II (3), 73 lines, beginning,

Ergo ut ventorum rabiem, pelagique furorem
Indomitum aspexit, fatis heu poscitur, inquit,
Poscitur infoelix Cicero: convertite vela,
Et me vicinae moriturum reddite ripae.

(10). Grimald: Of M. T. Cicero (125).

For Tullie late, a toomb I gan prepare:
When Cynthie, thus, bad mee my labour spare.
Such maner things becoom the ded, quoth hee:
But Tullie liues, and styll alyue shall bee.

Beza: T. Livii (65).[5]

Tumulum Tito nuper parabam Livio;
Cum sic Apollo jussit ut desisterem:
Haec mortuos, inquit, decent; vivit Titus.

(11). My last entry represents a free adaptation rather than a translation.

Grimald: To m. D. A. (107).

Gorgeous attire, by art made trym, and clene,

[5] Kendall's version of this tristich, in *Flowers of Epigrammes*, is adapted from Grimald's:

OF TITUS LIUIUS.

For Liuie late a Tombe I gan ordaine,
  what meanest thou Apollo said, refraine:
Such maner things become the dead (q^{th} he)
  but Liuie liues, and still aliue shalbe.

Digitized by Google   Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

Cheyn, bracelet, perl, or gem of Indian riuer,
To you I nil, ne can (good Damascene)
This time of Ianus Calends, here deliuer.
But what? My hert: which, though long sins certain
Your own it was, aye present at your hest:
Yet here itself doth it resigne agayn,
Within these noombers closde. Where, think you best
This to repose? There, I suppose, where free
Minerue you place. For it hath you embraste,
As thHeliconian Nymphs: with whom, euen hee,
That burn for soom, Apollo liueth chaste.
Presents in case by raarnesse you esteem:
O Lord, how great a gift shall this then seem?

Beza: Xenium Candidae (85).
Vestes divitiis graves et arte,
Aptandumve tuo monile collo,
Aut quos India mittit uniones,
Jani nec queo, nec volo Calendis
Ad te mittere, Candida, una Bezae
Dilectissima Candida. At quid ergo?
Ipsam nempe animam tibi dicatam,
Amorisque tui ignibus perustam:
Quae, pridem tua sit licet, suamque
Te pridem dominam vocetque ametque,
Se rursus tibi datque, dedicatque,
Inclusa his numeris Phaleuciorum.
Quod si munera raritate censes,
O Di! quam tibi grande mitto munus!

These borrowings of Grimald's call for no extended comment. After finding so many, one can readily believe that others of this poet's contributions to *Songes and Sonettes* may also be renderings from contemporary or then recent Latin writers.[6] "The Muses"

[6] "Vpon the death of lord Mautrauers" (118) is headed, "out of doctor Haddons latine." And it has long been known that "The death of Zoroas" (120) is from the *Alexandreis* of Phillipus Gualtherus, a twelfth-century Latin poet. The following, "To his familiar friend" (108),

No image carued with coonnyng hand, no cloth of purple dye,
No precious weight of metall bright, no siluer plate gyue I:
Such gear allures not heuenly herts: such gifts no grace they bring:
I lo, yat know your minde, will send none such, what then? nothing,

is plainly based on these lines from the *Juvenilia* of Muretus (Marc-Antoine Muret):

Non tibi pro xeniis, fulvi pretiosa metalli
Pondera, non docta signa polita manu,

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

(100) and "The Garden" (111) look suspiciously like translations; and it may yet come to light that his admired funeral song upon the death of his mother (115) is taken from the verses of some Neo-Latinist.

To return to the statements of Courthope with which we began, —a new significance has been given to his emphasis upon the epigrammatic, conceited, and "metaphysical" qualities of Grimald's work. For we see that these qualities belong to the Latin sources from which he translates; and we are pointed to sixteenth-century Latin poetry as a factor in some of the most important tendencies in English poetry in the early Renaissance. The connection of the writing and translating of Latin verse, especially of epigrams, with the widespread presence of the conceit in Elizabethan poetry, I hope to make the subject of a later study.

Swarthmore College. HOYT HOPEWELL HUDSON.

THE TRUE SOURCES OF ROBERT DODSLEY'S *THE KING AND THE MILLER OF MANSFIELD*

Carlo Goldoni, whose operetta *Il Re Alla Caccia* was written during his sojourn at Paris in 1763, states in his memoirs that he had attended the première of Sedaine's comedy *Le Roi et le Fermier* in November, 1762, and that *La Partie de Chasse de Henri IV*, a very popular play by Charles Collé, also had come to his attention. Concerning the sources of these three pieces, all of which were written within four years, Goldoni says: "Pareva bensì che le composizioni di questi due autori francesi imitato avessero quella del *Re Ed Il Mugnajo,* commedia inglese di Mansfield, ma la vera sorgente di tutti questi soggetti trovasi nell' *Alcade di Zalamea,* commedia spagnuola di Calderón." [1]

But Goldoni must have neglected to read the prefaces of the Sedaine and Collé plays, wherein both authors confess their debt to the English comedy. In quoting the title of this play, he had not even taken the precaution to ascertain the author's name, for,

[1] Carlo Goldoni, *Memorie*, II, 165, Firenze, 1831.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

though the true title is *The King and the Miller of Mansfield* and the author is Robert Dodsley, he gives it as *The King and the Miller,* an English comedy *by* Mansfield, which he apparently thought was the name of an English dramatist.[2] As a matter of fact, the most superficial study of Calderón's play shows that it differs widely from the others and that Goldoni's attribution is gratuitous.

CALDERÓN	DODSLEY, COLLÉ, SEDAINE, GOLDONI.
A regiment is quartered overnight in Zalamea. Captain Alvaro abducts Isabel, daughter of Crespo, rich farmer of Zalamea, who being elected mayor of the town, punishes the seducer. The king arrives just after the execution, and after berating Crespo for usurping royal authority, approves everything and makes him mayor perpetual.	The King lost a-hunting is taken home by miller who is ignorant of his true quality. The king enjoys simple hospitality and learns of wrongs done by one of his courtiers to miller's daughter. On the morrow the king's retinue find him in cottage. The king does justice to all and bestows dowry on girl.

It is indeed strange that Goldoni should have been ignorant of the existence of this identical story in popular legends and ballad literature. The King and His Subject theme is very generally diffused throughout folk-literature, especially in ballad form. Replicates are found in German, Danish, Russian, Belgian, Bohemian, French, Italian, English, Scotch, and Oriental literatures.

As Robert Dodsley grew up in the town of Mansfield, it does not seem improbable that he knew the ballad of *The King and the Miller of Mansfield* which was first printed in 1624. At any rate it contains essentially The King and His Subject story as told by Dodsley. King Henry, lost a-hunting in Sherwood Forest, meets the miller who brings him to the mill and entertains him, unaware of his real identity. Next morning the king's party arrives in search of their master. The miller is terrified on discovering the

[2] In the English version of the Goldoni *Memoirs*, translated by John Black, London, 1828, II, 155, the passage in question is corrected as follows: "The works of these two French authors appear to be imitations of *The King and the Miller of Mansfield*, an English comedy."

Digitized by Google

Original from
UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

true quality of his guest. But the king, instead of punishing him for lèse-majesté, knights and rewards his honest subject.

Dodsley was content to follow the balled narrative for his main motif, but he added a secondary theme, the love story, to make the material more acceptable in dramatized form.[3] This love-story, not found in the ballad, occurs almost in identical form in Painter's *Palace of Pleasure,* first published in 1566 and containing the first English versions of the *Decameron,* the *Heptameron,* and the *Novelle* of Bandello. Two stories in Painter's collection show a striking resemblance to Dodsley's secondary theme. A tale entitled *Alexander de Medice and the Miller's Daughter* relates in brief: "The just act of Alexander, Duke of Florence, upon a gentleman whom he favored who having ravished the daughter of a poor myller, caused him to marry hir, for the greater honor and celebration whereof he appointed a rich and honorable dowry." Painter quotes the source of this story as the *Novelle* of Bandello, III, xv. The author's argument reads: "Alessandro duca di Firenze fa che Pietro sposa una mugnaia che aveva rapita e le fa far molto ricca dote." In another story told by Painter, *Kyng Mansor of Morocco,* is related: "The great curtesie of the kyng of Morocco (a citty in Barbarie), toward a poore fisherman, one of his subjects, that had lodged the kyng, being strayed from his hunting." This is, again, the King and His Subject theme as told by Dodsley. Were there no English ballad source of this story, the Painter version might very plausibly be considered the ancestor of Dodsley's major theme. There is one bit of internal evidence which seems to prove that the English dramatist had read Painter's story. One speech and incident found in the play is not present in the ballad. The miller (of the play), being asked to escort the king back to the palace says: "I would not go back with you tonight if you were the king." In Painter's *Kyng Mansor of Morocco* is found: "If Kyng Mansor were here hymself and made the lyke request I would not take uppon me to bryng him to his palace." Painter attributes this story also to Bandello, and it occurs as novella 57 of Book I, where the author says in resumé

[3] Ralph Straus, in his study on R. Dodsley, *Robert Dodsley,* New York, 1910, p. 57, indicates the ballad source of Dodsley's main theme, but states only that the dramatist added the love story.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

"Una cortesia usata da Mansor, re e pontefice maomettano di Marocco, ad un povere pescatore suo soggetto." [4]

University of Minnesota. OLAV K. LUNDEBERG.

A NOTE ON CYNEWULF.

The opening lines of the *Christ* of Cynewulf are translated by Whitman as follows:

—— to the King.

Thou art the corner-stone which the builders once rejected in their work; fitting indeed is it for Thee, O King of glory, to become the head of this noble temple, and to join in bond secure the broad walls of adamantine rock.

I wish to discuss the two words, *flint unbræcne,* in line 6, which Whitman renders by 'adamantine rock.' The reason for the appearance of these words instead of 'unbreakable flint' in the translation, other than for euphony, and harmony with the context, is not clear. While it is true that *adamantine* implies the quality of hardness, it loses some force by suggesting the historically varied meaning of its root. Again, the generic word *rock* does not bring before the reader as immediate and definite an image as does *flint,* a specific word. Why did Cynewulf use *flint unbræcne?*

Let me quote a passage from Sir Bannister Fletcher's *History of Architecture:* [1]

The varied geological formation of Great Britain was responsible for the variety of materials employed in building. . . . It is natural that in early times the material at hand should have been employed, and thus in itself give local character, but as methods of transport improved there has been a tendency for local distinctions to disappear. . . . The flint work of Norfolk, Suffolk, and part of the south coast gives pronounced local character to the churches of these districts.

[4] Thanks are due Dr. G. L. Van Roosbroeck of the University of Minnesota for valuable suggestions.

[1] Sixth edition, p. 312.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

He adds under A. D. 607-800:

The conversion to Christianity of Saxon kings and their people is evidenced by the numerous churches, towers, and crosses of this period, many of which still remain.

From *The English Parish Church*,[2] by J. Charles Cox, we have the following:

Flint, as distinct from building stone, plays a very important part in English church architecture; it is but rarely used in any part of the Continent. . . . In almost all parts of England where there are chalk downs, the use of flint in church building is of common occurrence. *But it is in East Anglia that its use is so continuous as to put stone or any other material completely in the background.* The building flints of Norfolk and Suffolk were, in the first instance, mostly gathered from the seashore, or from the surface of the fields. The small, simple churches of the days of St. Felix [3] in the seventh century, and of his immediate successors, would probably be constructed of the surface flints or seashore pebbles. The earliest of these church-fabrics disappeared before the fierce onslaughts of the bands of pagan Danes who so constantly harried East Anglia in the ninth century.

It is possible that some of the round towers of East Anglia were partly constructed as a defence or place of refuge if such onslaughts were continued. A few of these towers, about which there has been so much discussion and conflict, are possibly even ninth-century, whilst about thirty are certainly pre-Norman. These round towers are everywhere built of flints or sea pebbles, with an occasional use of general rubble, and bonded together with an abundance of mortar. . . . Irrespective of ruined portions, the round towers of Norfolk number one hundred and thirty, and those of Suffolk forty. . . .

A fair amount of undressed flint walling, when taken in combination with the use of Roman tiles, is of pre-Norman date; but the use of this material throughout East Anglia, and in other parts where chalk abounded, continued in rubble form until towards the end of the fourteenth century.

Professor Albert S. Cook has referred to the discussion of Cynewulf's identity in his editions of the *Christ* and *Elene*. In the first he suggests the possibility of the author of these poems being Cynulf, a priest of Dunwich, whose name is appended to a decree

[2] Chapter IV, *Materials*, pp. 234 ff.; the italics are mine.

[3] Felix of Burgundy, who came to England about 631, and later was made bishop of Dunwich in what is now Suffolk.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

of the council of Clovesho in 803; in the latter he merely believes the poet to have been a Northumbrian, or at least an Anglian, ecclesiastic.

Wordsworth [4] gives us a hint as to the care exercised by poets in the choice of words. He says:

> I have at all times endeavored to look steadily at my subject; consequently, there is, I hope, in [my] poems little falsehood of description, and my ideas are expressed in language fitted to their respective importance. Something must have been gained by this practice, as it is friendly to one property of all good poetry, namely, good sense.

Is it not possible that Cynewulf spent much time in the flint district about Dunwich, though he may have written the poem later in the north, and that the word *flint,* so closely related to church-building in East Anglia, was selected by him as especially fit to use in describing a temple in the opening lines of his *Christ?* [5]

James M. Lindeman.

Cornell University.

FAHRWOHL!

Eine wortgeschichtliche Untersuchung

Schubart gibt in der *Vaterländischen Chronik* vom Jahre 1789, S. 206, die Übersetzung einer lateinischen Inschrift auf dem Grabe der Tochter des englischen Gelehrten Lowth, worin die folgenden Zeilen vorkommen: "Liebe, fahrewohl, warst so klug, so fromm, . . . Liebe, fahrewohl! Liebs Mariechen, fahrewohl!" Dazu macht er die Anmerkung: "Warum sollten wir das englische *farewell* nicht aufnehmen dürfen, da es ohnehin ein Zögling von uns ist?" [1] Schubart ist also der Ansicht, dass das deutsche *fahre wohl!* dem englischen *farewell* nachgebildet ist, das seinerseits dem Deutschen entstamme.

[4] *Wordsworth's Literary Criticism*, ed. by Nowell Smith, p. 18.

[5] For Cook's latest view, tending to accept the identification of the poet with Bishop Cynewulf of Lindisfarne, see *Transactions of the Connecticut Academy of Arts and Sciences*, 26 (1924), 273.

[1] Vgl. Feldmann, *Zeitsch. f. deutsche Wortforsch.* XI, 106; *DWb.* III, Sp. 1253.

Digitized by Google

Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

Bekanntlich findet sich dieser imperativische Abschiedsgruss nicht nur im Englischen, sondern auch in den skandinavischen Sprachen und im Holländischen und ist hier seit alters gebräuchlich. Nicht so leicht lässt sich die historische Berechtigung von Schubarts Behauptung für das Hochdeutsche nachweisen oder widerlegen. In keinem Wörterbuch findet sich ein Beleg für diesen Abschiedsgruss, der älter wäre als das 18. Jahrhundert. Im *DWb.* ist der älteste Beleg aus Hagedorn, das substantivische "Fahrwohl" wird als Stichwort verzeichnet mit einem Beleg aus Kosegarten (1805). In der *Deutschen Grammatik,* III, 306, führt Grimm "einige gangbare imperativformeln hauptsächlich der älteren zeit" an, darunter "fahr wohl!," doch ohne Beleg. Sanders verweist auf Goethes *Römische Elegien* II, Z. 5 "Auch ihr übrigen fahret mir wohl," das substantivische Fahrwohl fehlt bei ihm. Heyne verweist auf Schillers *Fiesko* V 8; Weigand[5] gibt keinen Beleg. Hermann Paul[2] bemerkt: "fahre wohl, früher allgemeiner Gruss für einen Scheidenden (wie engl. *farewell*), jetzt durch Lebewohl ersetzt und nur noch gebraucht zum Ausdruck, dass man etwas aufgibt." Belege fehlen. Bei Müller-Zarncke und Lexer findet sich keine Stelle, die den Gebrauch dieser Abschiedsformel fürs Mhd. nachweisen würde, doch finden sich Belege für *varen* = leben, sich befinden.

Auch in den älteren Wörterbüchern sucht man vergebens nach dieser Formel. Maler, 1561, S. 131: "valeas Far, far, Strich, Pack dich. Farhin, Heb dich nun yetz abi; Farhin, Du bist ein feiner gesel, Gang, du bist ein redlicher Mann." Henisch, 1616, Sp. 20: "Ade, adi, adieu, Gott behüt dich, Gott bewahr dich, gut nacht, vale." Wie häufig, so gibt Henisch auch hier den entsprechenden englischen Ausdruck: "farewell, God be with thee." Sp. 971 führt Henisch aus Maler an: "Fahr, far stich (für strich) pack dich valeas. fahrhin, heb dich nun jetzund abi, abi iam etc." Sp. 975: "er fahre hin valeat so fahr er immer hin, so hat er ein guts jahr quae per contentum reijicimus, verbo valere etiam enunciamus." Nehring, *Manuale Juridico-Politicum*, Frankfurt und Gotha, 1687, S. 773: "Vale gehab dich wohl, Gott befohlen, lebe wohl." Stieler, 1691, kennt "fahre wohl" nicht, eben so wenig Frisch, 1741. Im Register der lateinischen Wörter übersetzt Frisch *vale* durch "Gott behüte dich, gehab dich wohl, hiemit Gott befohlen." Adelung kennt den Ausdruck nicht, verzeichnet

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

aber *fahren* = leben unter 8 als "unbekannt gewordenen Gebrauch." Campe, 1808, gibt als 4. Bedeutung von fahren: "leben, fahre wohl! lebe wohl! Uneigentlich auch von einem Orte, einer Zeit etc." Er führt zwei Belege an aus Kosegarten und Schillers *Kindesmörderin.*

Pomais *Lexicon Latino-Gallico-Germanicum,* 1709, verzeichnet S. 330: "*vale* Gott behüte dich;" im französ.-lat.-deutschen Teil, S. 15: "*a dieu* behüte dich Gott, *adieu, plaisirs du monde* gute Nacht ihr Weltfreuden." Ludwigs *Englisch-Teutsches Lexicon,* 1736, übersetzt *farewell* durch "gehabt euch wohl, lebet wohl, Gott behüte euch." (In der Ausgabe vom Jahre 1791 wird das unverändert wiederholt.) "*Farewell* subst. ein Abschied, *farewell the laws* . . . es ist mit den Gesetzen aus." Rondeau-Buxtorfs *Französ. deutsch. Wb.,* Basel, 1739, gibt S. 14: "*a dieu* adv. Gott befohlen; lebet wohl, gute Nacht. . . . *Adieu tous mes plaisirs* gute Nacht alle meine Ergötzlichkeiten."

In mehreren zweisprachigen Wörterbüchern des 18. Jahrhunderts findet sich jedoch der Abschiedsgruss. Ludwigs *Teutsch-Englisches Lexicon,* Leipzig, 1716, gibt "fahret wohl! *farewell; fare you well!,*" ebenso in der Ausgabe von 1745. Es ist das um so auffallender, als Ludwigs *Englisch-Teutsches Lexicon* vom Jahre 1736, wie oben bemerkt, ein deutsches "fahr wohl!" nicht kennt. M. Kramers *Nider-Hoch-Teutsch Dictionarium,* Nürnberg, 1719, verzeichnet unter vaaren: "Vaar weel! vaart wel! wol fahren, sich gehaben: fahrt, gehabt euch wol!" Man bekommt den Eindruck, dass dem Verfasser das hochdeutsche "fahrt wohl!" nicht recht geläufig ist. Im Hoch-Nider-Teutschen Teil findet sich kein "fahr wohl." Olof Linds *Schwedisch-Deutsches Wörterbuch,* 1749, gibt das schwedische *far wäl* wieder durch "lebt wohl! fahret wohl!". Im deutsch-schwedischen Teil findet sich "Fahret wohl! far wäl." J. G. P. Möllers grosses *Teutsch-Schwedisches und Schwedisch-Teutsches Wörterbuch* (3 Bände, Greifswald 1782, 1785, 1790) kennt dagegen kein hochdeutsches "fahr wohl." Er übersetzt das schwedische *farväl* durch "lebe wohl." (*Schwed. Teutsches Wb.* 1790). Möller wirft übrigens Olof Lind ungenügende Kenntnis der deutschen Sprache vor.

Wie aus dem obigen hervorgeht, findet sich ein hochdeutsches "fahr wohl" nicht in den deutschen und deutsch-französischen Wörterbüchern des 18. Jahrhunderts, wohl aber in solchen zwei-

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

sprachigen Wörterbüchern, wo der Ausdruck der einen Sprache schon lange angehört (englisch, holländisch, schwedisch).

Obgleich dieser Abschiedsgruss in den mhd. Wörterbüchern nicht belegt ist, so war er im Mhd. nicht unbekannt. Im 14. Jahrhundert finden wir ihn bei Heinrich Suso: "nu nit me zu diser zit! varent wol!"[2] Nach Steinhausens *Geschichte des deutschen Briefes,* I, 47, Anm. findet sich "fahret wol" als Schlussformel in Briefen des 14. und 15. Jahrhunderts, doch gibt er keine Belege. Für die spätere Zeit erwähnt er die Formel nicht. In Steinhausens *Deutschen Privatbriefen des Mittelalters* kommt die Formel in den hochdeutschen Briefen nicht vor, wohl aber einmal das niederdeutsche "varet wel" in einem niederdeutschen Brief, II, 25 (um 1446): "Darmede varet wel."

Man darf mit Sicherheit annehmen, dass "fahr wol" im Mhd. wenig gebräuchlich war. In den Romanen des Hans von Bühel aus dem Anfang des 15. Jahrhunderts kommt die Formel nicht vor, wie sich aus H. Fitschens Arbeit ergibt.[3] Das deutsche Volkslied kennt wohl ein "far hin" oder "far dahin" als Abschiedsformel, aber kein "fahr wol." Interessant ist der Vergleich einer Stelle in Konrad Flecks *Flore und Blanscheflure* mit der altschwedischen Bearbeitung desselben Stoffes. Bei Fleck sagt die Königin zu ihrem Sohne (ed. Golther, v. 2918 ff.) "owe lieber sun guoter, /nu müeze dich got bewarn/ und laze dich wol gevarn." Im altschwedischen *Flores och Blanzeflor* (ca. 1300, hg. von G. E. Klemming, Stockholm, 1844) sagt die Königin zum Sohne an der entsprechenden Stelle (v. 560): "Far nu vael."

Für das 16. Jahrhundert haben wir ein direktes Zeugnis Luthers in Bezug auf den Abschiedsgruss: "im Abscheiden sagen wir gehabt euch wol, habt gute Nacht, laszts euch wol gehen," *DWb.* unter gehaben, Sp. 2311, eine Stelle, die schon Dietz in seinem Lutherwörterbuch anführt. Da Dietz "fahr wohl" bei Luther nicht verzeichnet, so darf mit Bestimmheit angenommen werden, dass diese Abschiedsformel dem Sprachgebrauch Luthers fremd war. In der Bibelübersetzung kommt sie nicht vor. *Apostelgeschichte* XXIII, 39 sagt Luther "gehab dich wohl," ähnlich

[2] 28. Brief in K. Bihlmeyer, *Heinrich Seuses Deutsche Schriften,* Stuttgart 1907.

[3] *Anrede, Titulierung und Grussformen in den Romanen Hans von Bühels.* Greifswald, 1913.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

Apgesch. XV 29. Die niederdeutsche Bibel hat an beiden Stellen "Vare wol," bzw. "Varet wol," worauf schon Heynatz im *Antibarbarus* II, 16 aufmerksam macht. Die vorlutherischen hochdeutschen Bibeln haben an diesen beiden Stellen kein "fahr wohl," während sich hier in der englischen, schwedischen und holländischen Bibel *farewell* in den entsprechenden Formen findet.

Die beiden Bibelstellen beweisen, dass "fahr wohl" im Niederdeutschen des 16. Jahrhunderts gebräuchlich war. In Schiller-Lübbens *Mnd. Wörterbuch* findet sich kein Beleg für die Formel, wohl aber mehrere für "wol varen" im Sinne von "sich wohl befinden." Im *Middelnederlandsch Woordenboek* von Verwijs und Verdam VIII. Sp. 1258/9 werden zwei Beispiele für die Formel verzeichnet neben zahlreichen Belegen für "varen = sich befinden."

Aus dem 17. Jahrhundert liegen mir drei hochdeutsche Belege für diesen Abschiedsgruss vor, die alle nach England weisen. Ditfurth in den *Historischen Volksliedern vom Ende des 30 jährigen Krieges bis zum Beginn des siebenjährigen* (Heilbronn 1877) gibt mit der Jahreszahl 1649 ein Gedicht *König Karl und Cromwell,* worin der König ausruft (S. 16): "Fahr wohl, mein werthe Kron / leb wohl, mein Ehgemahl! . . ." Ähnlich lässt Gryphius in seinem Trauerspiel *Ermordete Majestät oder Carolus Stuardus* (1663) Akt V, Z. 455/6 den König vor seinem Tod ausrufen: "Fahrt wohl mit diesem band, welt, scepter, cron und stab! / Ade beherrschte reich! wir legen alles ab." In der 1. Ausgabe vom Jahre 1657 stand: "Ade mit diesem Band" etc. Im *Bestraften Brudermord* III 10 (ed. Creizenach S. 174) wird Hamlet von dem König nach England gesandt mit den Worten: "Nun so fahrt wohl, der Himmel sey mit Euch." Hamlet fasst den Ausdruck im Sinne von "reist wohl" auf, denn er erwiedert: "So kommt denn, ihr noblen Gesellen, Lasst uns fahren, lasst uns fahren nach England." Bei Shakespeare sagt Hamlet in dieser Szene (IV 4) zum König: "Farewell, dear mother."

Dass "fahr wohl" der poetischen Sprache des 17. Jahrhunderts nicht angehört, lässt sich aus dem poetischen Lexikon von Gotthilf Treuer ersehen.[4] Treuer gibt nach Stichwörtern geordnet Zitate aus den Dichtern des 17. Jahrhunderts. Vier eng gedruckte Oktavseiten sind dem Worte "Abschied" gewidmet. In den zitierten Stellen finden sich lebe wohl, gute Nacht, seid gesegnet,

[4] *Deutscher Dädalus oder Poetisches Lexicon,* Berlin 1675.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

ade, zeuch hin, gehab dich wohl (auch in der mehrzahl), aber kein fahr wohl. Auch in Hamanns *Poetischem Lexicon* (Leipzig 1737) findet sich kein "fahr wohl."

Nach Norddeutschland führen uns die ältesten Belege aus dem 18. Jahrhundert für diese Abschiedsformel. In einem zu Stockholm und Hamburg erschienenen *Gespräch- und Wörter-Büchlein von vier Sprachen, Lateinisch, Frantzösisch, Deutsch und Schwedisch* (Vgl. Noreen, *Vårt Språk,* I, 289) heisst es in einem Tischgespräch (S. 24): "Ich kan nicht länger verharren. Fahrt wol, ich gehe. Lat. *vale, ego abeo.* Franz. *adieu, je m'en vais.* Schwed. *Far wäl, jagh gar.*" In einem Gespräch zwischen Käufer und Verkäuferin (S. 129) heisst es: "Fahrt wohl, ich gehe. Schwed. *far wäl, jagh gar. Vale, abeo. Adieu, je m'en vais.* S. 135: "Fahret wohl, Frau. Schwed. *fahr wäl, Hustro. vale, matrona; adieu, Madame.*" An andern Stellen dieses Gesprächbüchleins wird das schwedische *far wäl* anders wiedergegeben, S. 107 durch lebet wohl, S. 151 Ade, mein Freund *far wäl min Wän;* S. 237 lebet wohl. Man darf aus diesen drei Stellen nicht den Schluss ziehen, dass "fahre wohl" am Anfang des 18. Jahrhunderts in der hochdeutschen Umgangssprache Norddeutschlands allgemein gebräuchlich gewesen wäre. Das Deutsche in diesem polyglotten Gesprächbüchlein zeigt an verschiedenen Stellen eine schwedische Färbung. Im 17. Jahrhundert und am Anfang des 18. wurde in Stockholm und andern schwedischen Städten noch viel Deutsch gesprochen, da ein gut Teil der städtischen Bevölkerung, besonders der Kaufmannschaft deutscher Abkunft war. Dass sich die deutsche Umgangssprache schwedisch abfärbte, ist nur natürlich. Das hochdeutsche "fahr wohl" kann daher auf schwedischen Einfluss zurückgehen.

Dieses Gesprächbüchlein ist jedoch nur eine schwedische Bearbeitung eines älteren Gesprächbüchleins, von dem viele verschiedene Ausgaben existieren. In der in Antwerpen 1585 gedruckten Ausgabe [5] heisst es am Ende des Tischgesprächs (S. 26): "Ade, ich gehe"; im Gespräch zwischen Käufer und Verkäuferin: "Nun

[5] *Dictionarium sampt etlichen nohtwendigen Gesprächen in Latinischer, Teutscher, Niederländischer, Frantzösischer, Spanischer und Italienischer Sprach, allen derselbigen Liebhabern sehr nützlich und nohtwendig. Dictionarium Hexaglosson com colloquiis aliquot sex linguarum Latine, Germanice Belgice Gallice Hispanice Italice.*

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

ade ich gehe" (S. 124) und später (S. 126) "ade frow, *vale matrona, a dieu Madame.*" Es ist jedenfalls nicht wahrscheinlich, dass man in der hochdeutschen Umgangssprache am Anfang des 18. Jh. "fahr wohl" gesagt haben sollte, wo man am Ende des 16. Jh. "ade" sagte. Eine Bearbeitung dieses Gesprächbüchleins, die in Venedig 1627 erschien, gibt "lebt wohl" (L3) für das niederdeutsche (flämische) *vaert wel,* ebenso die mit dieser Ausgabe fast identische in Amsterdam 1631 erschienene. In der schwedischen Ausgabe von Comenius' *Janua Linguarum* (Holmiae 1641) S. 259 no. 999 finden wir "Sey gegrüsst und gehabe dich wol. Ave et vale. Var hälsat och faar ther medh wäl."

In der Literatur des 18. Jh. finde ich "fahre wohl" zuerst bei dem Hamburger Mattheson in seiner Übersetzung von Elizabeth Rowe's *Friendship in Death* (*Freundschaft im Tode,* Hamburg 1734) S. 5: "wie er nun schon in Todes-Zügen lag, kam sie . . . zu ihm, um das letzte und kläglichste Fahre wohl! zu sagen." Im englischen Original (London 1733) S. 3 heisst es: "to take a last and sad farewell." In Matthesons Übersetzung ist "Fahre wohl" durch den Druck hervorgehoben, was im englischen Original nicht der Fall ist. Es muss also mit dem hochdeutschen "Fahre wohl" eine besondere Bewandtnis haben, entweder dass es ein ungewöhnlicher Ausdruck ist oder dass wenigstens der substantivische Gebrauch etwas Ungewöhnliches hat. Bekannt ist die Beliebtheit der Werke der "göttlichen Rowe" im Klopstockschen Kreise. Eine neue Übersetzung des Werks *Friendship in Death* erschien im Jahre 1745 in Göttingen. Diese Übersetzung beruht aber nicht auf dem englischen Original, sondern auf einer französischen Übersetzung. Hier kommt "fahre wohl" an der betreffenden Stelle nicht vor.

Durch Bodmer scheint "fahre wohl" zuerst in die Dichtersprache des 18. Jh. gekommen zu sein und ist seitdem ein Bestandteil der gehobenen Sprache geblieben. In die hochdeutsche Umgangssprache ist der Ausdruck nicht gedrungen. Bodmer unterzeichnet einen Brief an Breitinger vom Jahre 1723 mit *farewell.*[6] Der Brief selbst behandelt das *Verlorene Paradies,* es ist die Zeit wo die Übersetzung des Werks handschriftlich fast vollendet war. Das schöne englische Wort hat augenscheinlich Ein-

[6] H. Bodmer, *Die Anfänge des Züricherischen Milton* in *Studien zur Literaturgeschichte. Michael Bernays gewidmet* 1893 S. 188.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

druck auf Bodmer gemacht, er gebraucht es im Briefe an den Freund teils aus naivem Stolz auf seine Kenntnis des Englischen, sicher aber auch weil ihm das Wort besonders ausdrucksvoll erschien. Der entsprechende deutsche Ausdruck war ihm jedenfalls nicht geläufig. Das wird durch seine Übersetzung des *Verlorenen Paradieses* bestätigt (1732). An zwei Stellen gebraucht Milton das imperativische *farewell, P. L.* I 249 " " Farewell, happy fields " und *P. L.* IV 108/9 " So farewell hope and with hope farewell fear / Farewell remorse." Bodmer übersetzt " gehabe dich wohl," bzw. " gehabet euch wohl."

Bodmer gebraucht " fahr wohl " zum erstenmal in der Elegie auf den Tod seines Sohnes betitelt *" Trauer eines Vaters."* Die Elegie erschien im 3. Teile der *Schriften der deutschen Gesellschaft in Leipzig,* 1739, und wurde in den *Gedichten in gereimten Versen,* 1754, wieder abgedruckt, wohl auch in den mir nicht zugänglichen *Critischen Lobgedichten und Elegien* vom Jahre 1747. Die Stelle lautet:

> Fahr wohl, doch vor der Zeit, du jüngst noch meine Freude,
> Jezt künftig eine Quell zu unversiegnem Leide!
> Fahr wohl, zwar ohne mich, du liebster Theil von mir!

In den *Critischen Betrachtungen über die poetischen Gemählde der Dichter* (1741 S. 322 f.) hat Bodmer die dichterische Form dieser Elegie besprochen. Er gibt eine prosaische Auflösung derselben, die anfängt: " Gehabe dich wohl, meine liebste Helfte, die noch vor so kurtzer Zeit meine Freude gewesen war. . . . Gehabe dich wohl, wiewohl du ohne mich aus der Welt gehst." Für Bodmer ist also " Fahr wohl " ein dichterischer Ausdruck, der der Prosa nicht angehört. Bodmer vertrat bekanntlich den Grundsatz, dass sich die Dichtersprache von der Sprache der Prosa unterscheiden müsse. Zur Bereicherung seiner Sprache darf der deutsche Dichter älteren Dichtern und Schriftstellern gute ausdrucksvolle Worte entnehmen, er darf gute Provinzialworte anwenden und aus fremden Sprachen passende Wendungen nehmen und übersetzen. In der Einleitung zum 2. Bande der 4. Auflage seiner Milton Übersetzung (Zurich 1759, S. 23) spricht Bodmer von der Wirkung des " Miltonischen Geistes " auf die deutsche Sprache. " Sie hat neue Wörter empfangen, die ganz bequem, sanft und poetisch sind. Man hat zuweilen Ausdrücke und sogar besondere Eigenschaften anderer Sprachen in unsere hinüberge-

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

bracht, die ganz ungezwungen sind, . . . Wir bewundern die Fremdlinge in dem einheimischen Gewande, und freuen uns, wenn wir sie so frey und munter um sich schauen sehen, als ob sie gebohrne Deutsche wären." Bei der Wahl des Ausdrucks "fahr wohl" in der Elegie war sich Bodmer ohne Zweifel bewusst, dass der Ausdruck dem englischen *farewell* entsprach, dass er gewissermassen dem Englischen nachgebildet war, wahrscheinlich wusste er aber auch, dass der Ausdruck im Niederdeutschen und im älteren Hochdeutschen vorkam. Jedenfalls war er bis dahin Bodmers Sprachgebrauch fremd gewesen, und doch war er leicht verständlich, kurz, wohlklingend und im Metrum leicht verwendbar. Er diente dazu, den dichterischen Ausdruck von der Prosa zu unterscheiden. Bodmer gebraucht ihn substantivisch wieder im *Noah,* Ges. VIII, Z. 231: "Ruft (sie) nun ein festlich, ein ewiges Fahrwohl der Zierde der Mädchen." Der Vers ist einer in Richardsons *Clarissa Harlowe* vorkommenden Stelle nachgebildet, wo die deutsche Übersetzung (Göttingen 1751) VII, 595 "ein feierliches und ewiges Lebewohl" hat, das englische Original (London 1751) VII, 87 "a solemn an everlasting adieu." Der Norddeutsche Hagedorn, ein guter Kenner der englischen Sprache und Literatur, gebraucht die Formel in dem Lehrgedicht *Glückseligkeit* (1743), wo die Feldmaus Abschied nimmt mit den Worten: "Fahr wohl! Dies Leben dient mir nicht." (*Werke,* 1760 I, 27.)

Dass sich "fahr wohl" nur langsam in der Dichtersprache wie überhaupt in der gehobenen Sprache einbürgerte, kann man aus dem Verhalten der Übersetzer dem englischen *farewell* gegenüber ersehen. Bodmer hatte den Ausdruck in seiner Milton-Übersetzung nicht angewandt. Zachariae (1760) übersetzt *P. L.* I 249 "farewell happy fields" mit "Ihr glückseligen Gefilde . . . gehabt euch wohl, *P. L.* IV 108 dagegen: So fahre denn wohl, o Hoffnung etc. In Thomson's *Spring* Z. 997 f. (in den späteren Ausgaben Z. 1080 f.) finden wir: "ye fairy prospects, then ye beds of roses and ye bowers of joy, / Farewell!" Brockes (1745 und schon 1740) übersetzt: "Dann gute Nacht, ihr süssen Triebe! . . . Ihr Rosen-beten, holde Lauben ihr Bluhmen-reichen Lust-Alleen! Zu guter Nacht" . . Palthen (1758) und Tobler (1764) übersetzen "gehabt euch wohl," erst bei Schubart (1789) findet sich hier "fahret wohl." Swifts "farewell study" in der *Ars punica* (*Works,* ed. W. Scott XIII, 427) wird in der *Sammlung moral-*

Digitized by Google

Original from
UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

ischer und satyrischer Meisterstücke (Berlin und Leipzig 1738, S. 58) wiedergegeben durch "gehabe dich wohl, Studier-Stube." In derselben Sammlung (3. Teil, 1739, S. 84) wird die bekannte Stelle aus *König Heinrich VIII,* III, 2, "Farewell, a long farewell to all my greatness" wiedergegeben durch: "Fort! fort! auf ewig fort, mit allen Herrlichkeiten!" Frau Gottsched sagt dafür im 541. Stück des deutschen *Zuschauers* (1742): "Gute Nacht! Ach eine lange gute Nacht, zu aller meiner Hoheit!" Wieland hat in seiner Shakespeare-Übersetzung (1762-66) das bei Shakespeare überaus häufige *farewell* oft durch "fahre wohl" wiedergegeben, häufiger jedoch durch "lebe wohl," manchmal "durch gehab dich wohl," das jetzt schon altertümlich klingt. Doch gibt es auch eine Anzahl von Stellen, wo er Shakespeares *adieu* durch "fahre wohl" wiedergibt. Jedenfalls ist durch Wielands Shakespeare-Übersetzung diese Abschiedsformel zu einem festen Bestandteil der gehobenen Sprache im Nhd. geworden. Schon 1758 hatte Wieland den Ausdruck gebraucht in dem nach englischem Vorbild verfassten Trauerspiel *Lady Johanna Grey,* Akt III Sz. 5: "So fahret wohl, ihr goldenen Hoffnungen." Gerstenbergs Gebrauch des Ausdrucks im *Ugolino* darf wohl auf Shakespeare zurückgeführt werden: "Fahre wohl, Unschuld!" "fahre wohl! schöner Knabe, fahre wohl!" (ed. Hamel, S. 260, 264.) Goethe gebraucht ihn in der *Geschichte Gottfrieds von Berlichingen* (1771): "Unversehens wird er dich wegreissen, und dann fahre wohl Freiheit." (Morris, *Der junge Goethe* II, 184.) In der Ausgabe von 1773 fehlt diese Stelle.

Der norddeutsche Übersetzer von Richardsons *Clarissa Harlowe* (Göttingen 1748-51) hat "fahr wohl" an zwei Stellen: Bd. V S. 485 (1750): "fahre wohl, fahre wohl, fahre du wohl auf ewig." Im englischen Original (London 1751 3. Aufl. Bd. IV, Letter 47) steht hier jedesmal *adieu.* In demselben Band, S. 626, heisst es in einem Gedicht: "So fahre wohl, der Jugend Pracht? / So gute Nacht den frohen Stunden . . . So selbst dem Leben gute Nacht!" entsprechend dem englischen "Then farewell, youth, / And all the joys that dwell / With youth and life! / And life itself farewell!" Sonst findet sich in der deutschen *Clarissa* nur "lebe wohl," wie im deutschen *Grandison* (Leipzig 1754/5), auch wo im Englischen *farewell* vorkommt. In der anonym erschienenen Übersetzung von Drydens *State of Innocence* [7] wird *farewell,* Akt

[7] *Der Stand der Unschuld und Fall des Menschen.* Frankfurt und Leipzig, 1754.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

II Sz. 4, durch "gehab dich wohl" wiedergegeben, ebenso V, 6: "gehabt euch wohl, ihr Blumen"; "So gehab dich denn wohl, alles, was um mich ist." Der Schweizer Grynäus sagt in seiner Übersetzung von Miltons *Samson Agonistes* (Basel 1752, S. 181): "Brüder, gehabt euch wohl" für Miltons *Brethren, farewell* (Z. 1413). Dusch gibt in seiner Übersetzung von Pope (Altona 1758-62) das englische *farewell* zweimal durch "fahre wohl" wieder. Bd. I S. 31 Fahrt wohl, ihr Wälder. I, 37 fahret wohl, ihr Thäler, ihr Berge . . . fahret wohl . . . Und alle Welt, fahre wohl"; dagegen IV, 150: "Lebt dann wohl, ihr Verse" *farewell then verse;* IV, 218: "Gehabe dich wohl, o Bühne" *farewell the stage.*

Maler Müller gebraucht den Ausdruck in der Idylle *Der Faun* (1775) "So fahre denn wohl . . . liebes, liebes Weib du!" Bezeichnend ist dass auch W. C. S. Mylius in seinem nach dem Französischen des Grafen Hamilton gearbeiteten *Märlein* (1777) den Ausdruck anwendet. Sein Stil ist eine Mischung von altertümlichen Wörtern und von Ausdrücken der neuen Dichtersprache. S. 79: "dass sie hin in Ohnmacht sank wie sie das letzte Fahr wohl! niederschrieb." Ebenso S. 488: "auf dass sie . . . das letzte Fahr wohl! sagen könnte." Schiller gebraucht den Ausdruck in der *Kindesmörderin* (1781), trotzdem findet ihn Schubart im Jahre 1789 noch so ungewöhnlich, dass er die oben angeführte Anmerkung dazu schreibt. Goethe wendet ihn in seiner klassizistischen Periode an, deren Stil grundsätzlich von dem der Prosa abweicht; *Pandora* (1807 gedichtet) Z. 1081 "fahre wohl, du Menschenvater," wie er ihn schon in der ersten Bearbeitung des *Goetz* und in den *Römischen Elegien* angewandt hatte.

Fassen wir zusammen. Der Abschiedsgruss "fahr wohl," der im Englischen, Skandinavischen, Holländischen und Niederdeutschen von alters her gebräuchlich war, ist im Hochdeutschen auch in der älteren Zeit nur spärlich zu belegen. Im 16. Jh. ist er so gut wie unbekannt, wie die angeführte Stelle aus Luther beweist. Die Lutherische und die vorlutherischen hochdeutschen Bibelübersetzungen kennen ihn nicht, während er sich in der englischen, holländischen, schwedischen und niederdeutschen Bibel findet. Dass er im Niederdeutschen im 16. Jh. gebräuchlich war, geht aus seiner Verwendung in der niederdeutschen Bibel klar hervor. Wie weit er in allgemeinem Gebrauch war, wird sich schwer entscheiden lassen. In Norddeutschland war der Gruss auch

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

im 17. Jh. nicht ganz unbekannt, obgleich er nicht eigentlich der Dichtersprache angehörte. In die hochdeutsche Dichtersprache ist er erst im 18. Jh. gedrungen durch Bodmer und vor allem durch Wielands Shakespeareübersetzung. Er ist kein Anglizismus, wie Schubart anzunehmen scheint, ist aber vor allem durch englischen Einfluss zum festen Bestandteil der nhd. Dichtersprache geworden.

JOHN A. WALZ.

Harvard University.

OLD FRENCH: *DAVEDET, DAVOUDET, DAVOUDEL*

These rare words in Old French are listed by Godefroy in the *Dictionnaire* with the meaning of *vantard,* although the three passages quoted by him do not seem to express unanimously that sense. Following his indications let us quote the several passages somewhat more at length than he has done, for the sake of clarity:

(a) [1]

Sire, l'amor Robenet
mi destraint et loie.
je l'ain plus ke Garinet
ki ades mi proie.
trop folle seroie
s'un teil *davedet*
amoie, au briolet,
trop me meteroie.
' J'aimerai Robesonnet
cui ke il anoie.'

(b) [2]

Guis du frestel au chalemel
biau s'acorde et amoie
ki ot jupel a rabardel;
plus s'efforce et cointoie.
Perrins mult s'i desroie,
qui cote ot nueve de burel
a roie de brunete;
notant a la musete

---

[1] Karl Bartsch: Altfranzösische Romanzen und Pastourellen (Leipzig, 1870), II, 45, v. 21-30.

[2] *Ibid.*, II, 58, v. 45-59.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

aloit torniant ses caviaus:
'civalala duri duriaus,
civalala durete.'

Dist Dreus 'Perrel le *davoudel*
fait, trop mult m'en anoie,
n'i voi dancel si cointerel:
car te va, si te noie.'

(c) [8]

J'en cuideroies tu miex chevir que je n'ai fait?
Tu n'es que un bourdeur et .l. droit *davoudet.*

These words are evidently used in these passages as uncomplimentary epithets. *Davedet* in (a) is too vague for us to assign a definite sense to it· In (b) *davoudel* seems to indicate a vain person in gay attire rather than a *vantard,* for Perrel does not speak. If *davoudet* in (c) is synonymous with *bourdeur,* it would mean a cheat, liar, *dupeur.* I have nowhere found any suggestions as to the etymology of these words nor as to an explanation of their meaning. The etymological dictionaries have omitted consideration of them.

Before taking up these questions let us examine three unlisted passages in which the word *davadiax, davoudiaus* occurs. The first of these is found in a *pastourelle* of Moniot de Paris and is printed in Bartsch, *op. cit.,* III, 44. In verse 20 of the poem the last word as printed by Bartsch is *damoïsiaus* (the reading of MS. Arsenal 5198, f. 193) but a second version of the poem (MS. *Bibliothèque Nationale,* 845, f. 92) contains the variant *davadiax.* The passage is here quoted, substituting the reading of the MS. of the *Bibliothèque Nationale:*

(d)

Et d'autre part Robinet
qui grant ponee demaine;
pipe avoit et flaiolet,
et flaiole a douce alaine,
car por Marguerot se paine
qui plus ert blanche que laine.
Robinet chante et frestele
et trepe et crie et sautele,
Margot en chantant apele.

[8] *Le Dit de Ménage, pièce en vers du XIII[e] siècle,* ed. Trébutien (Paris, 1835), v. 113.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

Robins estoit asses biaus
et la pastorele bele,
Robins ert biaus *davadiax*
et bele ert la pastorele,
car blons avoit les cheviaus
et durete la mamele.
Robins ert biaus garconciaus,
si s'en cointoie et revele.
petit avoient d'aigniaus
et grande ere la praele.
lors fu sones li frestiaus
par desos la fontenele;
lors la joie renouvele;
Robins oste sa gonnele.
Robinet chante et frestele, etc.

The two following passages are taken from an unedited poem entitled *Del Fol Vilain* of a 13th century Picard *jongleur,* Gautier Le Leu, found in an early 13th century manuscript now in the private library of Lord Middleton of Wollaton Hall, Nottinghamshire. In the first passage, the *fol vilain* is out walking:

(e)

Il ascouta aval les cans
S'oī des *davodiaus* les cans.

The second passage is taken from a wedding scene:

(f)

S'i ot .xl. *davodiaus*
A flahutes et a festiaus.

In passage (e) the word *davodiaus* is evidently a term applied to singers and in (f) it refers to musicians playing flutes of several varieties. On the strength of the meaning musician established by (e) and (f) the reading *davadiax* for *damoisiaus* in (d) seems excellent, for Robinet is a flute player. *Damoisiaus* is a colorless word repeated four lines below in *garconciaus.*

The new and general sense of musician as indicated in passages (d), (e), and (f) suggests an etymology, the proper name *Davīd* plus the diminutive suffixes *-ellus* and *-ittus,* the latter frequenly used as a suffix for proper names. Du Cange, *Glossarium,* III, 12, gives two references to David used in mediaeval Latin to indicate the psalter:

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

David: psalterium Davidis dictum
Daviticum[4]*:* psalterium Davidis

If this etymon be accepted, *davedet*[5] is closer to the original form; *davoudet, davoudel* and *davodiaus* show transformation of the intertonic vowel, probably due to the assimilating influence of the preceding labial consonant; *davadiax* would show assimilation of the intertonic vowel to the vowel of the initial syllable in quality, if it can be considered at all as anything but scribal.

The words probably meant at first one who sings the psalms of David or one who plays the accompaniment. It is true that the harp or psaltery as instrument of accompaniment has been associated with David at all periods, but there are abundant passages in mediaeval literature to show that harp music was very frequently accompanied by that of other instruments, especially varieties of the flute.[6] *Davodel* in (e) seems to present the sense of one who sings,[7] whereas in (d) and (f) it clearly indicates flute players. In (f) they appear to be professional musicians.

A sense of *vantard* or rather vain and arrogant person which seems to fit the word in (b) may have developed from a meaning musician taken in a pejorative sense: one who makes a noise and attracts attention. The following verses of (d) seem to bear out this supposition:

Et d'autre part Robinet

---

[4] For another French compound of *David* cf. Villon, *Grand Testament,* XXXVII, *v.* 291:

Selon les *davitiques* dis,

Examples of transformation of proper nouns into common nouns are not unusual in the history of French. English *davit* and French *davier* (name of an instrument) are given by the etymological dictionaries (Skeat and the *Dict. Gén.*), as being derived from the name *Davi* (David). According to Ménage the latter word was still *david* in the XVII century. Rabelais (II, 16) in the XVI century has *daviet,* using a suffix similar to the one in *davedet.* The last syllable of *davier* is probably a corruption of the suffix.

[5] The word in any case hardly represents a purely popular development. The *i* of David is long, to judge by its quantity in Latin poetry. It is interesting to note here the variants for the intertonic vowel.

[6] See for example the texts quoted by Godefroy under *frestel.*

[7] We have a somewhat analogous tendency in modern slang. I have heard a man with a good voice spoken of as a "regular Caruso." Here the idea might have been at the start "a regular little David."

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

qui grant ponee[8] demaine
pipe avoit et flaiolet
et flaiole a douce alaine.

We have an example of similar development in English where a braggart or vain person is often alluded to in popular parlance as one "who blows his own horn."

From a sense of flute player, *davodel,* etc., might have taken on a meaning similar to French *pipeur, dupeur, trompeur.*[9] O. F. *piper* meant *jouer de la pipe* and then *tromper.* Such a meaning for *davoudet* is apparently needed for (c) where it is linked with *bourdeur,* and seems to suit (a) also where a trap is spoken of.[10] This is of course assuming that a *Davīd* with *-ellus* and *ittus* was used in much the same manner, as appears to be the case.

So if we were listing the words in a dictionary we would be apt to note them as follows: *davodel, davoudel, davadel, davedet, davoudet* < Latin *Davīd* plus -ĕllus ou -ĭttus: chanteur, joueur de flute, musicien, vantard, un vaniteux, un arrogant, pipeur, trompeur.

C. H. LIVINGSTON.

Bowdoin College.

THE BEETHOVEN SYMPHONY IN BALZAC'S *CESAR BIROTTEAU*

In a series of studies on *le Sentiment musical chez les écrivains de 1830* M. Gabriel Rouchès devotes four articles to a consideration of the musical element in the author of *la Comédie humaine.*[1] He endeavors first to determine "the exact place" that music had in the existence of Honoré de Balzac, then passes in review the various musicians who are to be found in *la Comédie humaine,*—

[8] *ponee, posnee;* orgueil, arrogance, bravade, jactance, parole, action arrogante ou insolente (God).

[9] The possibility of such a development was suggested to me by Professor E. C. Armstrong.

[10] The development of a sense *tromper* for *piper* is, however, much clearer than in the case of *davedet,* etc. The figurative sense "réussir dans un artifice" has grown out of the sense "attirer les oiseaux pour les prendre en imitant le cri de la chouette ou le cri de leur espèce."

[1] *Le Courrier musical,* 1er et 15 décembre, 1904; 1er et 15 janvier, 1905.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

Cousin Pons, Wilhelm Schwab, Schmucke, Valentin Mirouet, Ursule Mirouet, Modeste Mignon, Josépha Mirah, Conti, Camille Maupin, Gambara, Gigelmi, Tinti, Genovese,—and finally examines the musical *esthétique* of the great novelist in *Gambara* and *Massimilla Doni.* He concludes that, like many of his contemporaries, Balzac was really appreciative only of the light, frivolous music of the Italian theatre, or of the "clinquant" and false "pierreries" of Meyerbeer. Balzac admired Beethoven, Weber, and Mozart,—but his admiration was founded on faith. His sense of music, was "très relatif." But he was genuinely interested in it and if he wrote of it inaccurately, he is not to be condemned. For, before establishing taste in music, one must establish taste for music, and Balzac contributed to propaganda for love of this art. "N'aurait-il fait que montrer son importance, n'aurait-il appris à la foule que le nom de quelques grands maîtres, pour toutes ces tentatives si médiocres qu'elles aient été, il a droit à notre reconnaissance."

As M. Rouchès has noted, love of music seems to have been particularly strong in Balzac during the year 1837 and early in the year 1838. It was at this time that he was writing *Gambara* (dated June 8, 1837), and *Massimilla Doni.*[2] He was also going frequently to the *Opéra* for documentation, and at the house of Olympe Pélissier, mistress of Eugène Sue and future wife of Rossini, he was constantly meeting such musicians as Berlioz, Auber, and Rossini, to whom he dedicated *le Contrat de mariage.* On one occasion, if we may believe Auguste Chalamel, Balzac became so enthusiastic in his admiration for the playing of Franz Liszt that he literally rolled on the floor and cried, "Bravo! Sublime! c'est le Dieu du piano!"

In spite of the fondness for what M. Rouchès calls "le clinquant et les fausses pierreries," in at least one of his works, Balzac did not hesitate to rank Beethoven above all other composers, above

[2] *Correspondance,* 281; *Lettres à l'Etrangère,* I, 398, 408, 409, 412, 430, 434, 437, 442, 449, 454, 458. *Massimilla Doni,* dated May 25, 1839, appeared at the end of the same year, divided into four chapters. But previously *la France musicale,* in its number of August 25, 1839, had published a fragment of this novel under the title: *Une représentation du Mosé de Rossini à Venise.* In 1840, *Massimilla Doni* was put into the *livre des douleurs.*

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

even Mozart and Rossini, he tells us himself. At a certain period in his literary career, at least one of Beethoven's compositions exercised an undeniable influence upon his imagination. Curiously enough it was in *César Birotteau,*—a novel of business so filled with commercial technicalities that Taine declared "il faut être presque négociant pour comprendre *César Birotteau,*" [3]—that this influence manifested itself.

The reason is not far to seek. It is to be found in the letters to Madame Hanska. Between Nov. 7 and Nov. 12, 1837, Balzac wrote her from Chaillot:

"Hier, je suis allé entendre *la Symphonie en ut mineur* [4] de Beethoven. Beethoven est le seul homme qui me fasse connaître la jalousie. J'aurais voulu être plutôt Beethoven que Rossini et que Mozart. Il y a dans cette [*sic*] homme une puissance divine. Dans son *finale,* il semble qu'un enchanteur vous enlève dans un monde merveilleux, au milieu des plus beaux palais qui réunissent les merveilles de tous les arts, et là, à son commandement, des portes, semblables à celles du Baptistère, tournent sur leurs gonds et vous laissent apercevoir des beautés d'un genre inconnu, les fées de la fantaisie. Ce sont des créatures qui voltigent avec les béautes de la femme et les ailes diaprées de l'ange, et vous êtes inondé de l'air supérieur, de cet air qui, selon Swedenborg, chante et répand des parfums, qui a la couleur et le sentiment, et qui afflue, et qui vous béatifie!" [5]

A few days after having written these words, Balzac plunged into the final composition of *César Birotteau,* which, as his correspondence shows, he had long had in mind. Nov. 14, 1837, he wrote from Chaillot to Madame Hanska:

"Adieu. Il faut se jeter dans un travail inopiné, qui peut me donner une *arachnitis.* On offre vingt mille francs de *César Birotteau* s'il est prêt pour le 10 décembre; j'ai un volume et demi à faire et la misère m'a fait promettre. Il faut travailler pendant vingt-cinq nuits et vingt-cinq jours. Ainsi, mille tendres choses. Je cours à Sèvres chercher les manuscrits commencés et les épreuves de cet ouvrage. Il n'y a que neuf feuilles de faites; il en faut quarante-six; reste trente-cinq [*sic*]. Il n'y a pas une minute à perdre.

---

[3] *Nouveaux essais de critique et d'histoire,* 9me éd., 22.

[4] Cf. *Gambara,* éd. C. Lévy, 159: "En ouvrant la symphonie en *ut mineur* de Beethoven, un homme de musique est bientôt transporté dans le monde de la fantaisie sur les ailes d'or du thème en *sol naturel,* répété en *mi* par les cors. Il voit toute une nature, tour à tour éclairée par d'éblouissantes gerbes de lumières, assombrie par des nuages de mélancolie, égayée par des chants divins."

[5] *Lettres à l'Etrangère,* I, 443.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

Adieu. Je serai ces vingt-cinq jours sans pouvoir vous écrire." [6]

His next letter to Madame Hanska, dated Paris, Dec. 20, 1837, begins as follows:

"Je viens de terminer en vingt-deux jours, comme je l'avais promis et comme je vous l'écrivais brusquement en terminant ma dernière lettre, *César Birotteau*. J'ai fait en même temps *la Maison Nucingen*, pour *la Presse*. C'est assez vous dire que je suis abattu, dans un état d'anéantissement inexprimable." [7]

In the first of these citations it is evident that Balzac is attempting to translate into words the impression which the Beethoven symphony had produced upon him. What he had briefly indicated in his correspondence is to be found in more fully developed form in the novel itself. In composing the latter, Balzac was evidently more careful of his style. He had his reading public consciously before him as he wrote, and the result is almost jargon.

The passage in question occurs almost at the end of Part I, which is entitled "*César à son Apogée*," and of which the final chapter bore in the first edition the title "*Le Bal*." It reads as follows:

"Dans l'oeuvre des huit symphonies de Beethoven, il est une fantaisie, grande comme un poëme, qui domine le finale de la symphonie en *ut* mineur. Quand, après les lentes préparations du sublime magicien si bien compris par Habeneck, un geste du chef d'orchestre enthousiaste lève la riche toile de cette décoration, en appelant de son archet l'éblouissant motif vers lequel toutes les puissances musicales ont convergé, les poëtes dont le coeur palpite alors comprendront que le bal de Birotteau produisait dans sa vie l'effet que produit sur leurs âmes ce fécond motif, auquel la symphonie en *ut* doit peut-être sa suprématie sur ses brillantes soeurs. Une fée radieuse s'élance en levant sa baguette. On entend le bruissement des rideaux de soie pourpre que des anges relèvent. Des portes d'or sculptées comme celles du baptistère florentin tournent sur leurs gonds de diamant. L'oeil s'abîme en des vues splendides, il embrasse une enfilade de palais merveilleux d'où glissent des êtres d'une nature supérieure. L'encens des prospé-

[6] *Ibid.*, I, 448-449. For an amusing account of the composition of *César Birotteau* cf. Edouard Ourliac, *Malheurs et Aventures de César Birotteau avant sa naissance*, Figaro, 15 décembre, 1837. Cited by Lovenjoul, *Hist. des oeuvres de H. de B.*, Paris, 1879, 359-361.

[7] *Ibid.*, I, 449.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

rités fume, l'autel du bonheur flambe, un air parfumé circule! Des êtres au sourire divin, vêtus de tuniques blanches bordées de bleu, passent légèrement sous vos yeux en vous montrant des figures surhumaines de beauté, des formes d'une délicatesse infinie. Les amours voltigent en répandant les flammes de leurs torches! Vous vous sentez aimé, vous êtes heureux d'un bonheur que vous aspirez sans le comprendre en vous baignant dans les flots de cette harmonie qui ruisselle et verse à chacun l'ambroisie qu'il s'est choisie. Vous êtes atteint au coeur dans vos secrètes espérances qui se réalisent pour un moment. Après vous avoir promené dans les cieux, l'enchanteur, par la profonde et mystérieuse transition des basses, vous replonge dans le marais des réalites froides, pour vous en sortir quand il vous a donné soif de ses divines mélodies, et que votre âme crie: "Encore!" L'histoire psychique du point le plus brillant de ce beau finale est celle des émotions prodiguées par cette fête à Constance et à César. Collinet avait composé de son galoubet le finale de leur symphonie commerciale."[8]

From this passage, written late in November or early in December, 1837, it is evident that the novelist had not forgotten, when he was writing *César Birotteau,* his delight at hearing Beethoven's symphony early in November. So vivid, indeed, was the memory of his pleasure that he repeated in the text of the novel words and phrases already used in his letter to Madame Hanska,—palais, des portes . . du baptistère . . tournent sur leurs gonds, beauté, fée, ange, air parfumé, merveilleux, fantaisie, voltigent, enchanteur, etc.,—and that he evoked and amplified in highly imaginative fashion for this masterpiece of commercial fiction sensations set up by Beethoven's music in his own recent experience.

A second recollection of the symphony is to be found later in the novel. Just as the bourgeois ball which marks the climax of the *grandeur* of the poor *parfumeur,* is described in terms of the finale of Beethoven, so the death of César, which is the climax of his *décadence,* is prepared for in similar terms. This passage occurs immediately after César's return from the Bourse to his home where his financial reconstitution is to be celebrated by a second fête, arranged as a surprise by his family. It reads:

"La joie était si vive dans tous les coeurs, que chacun attribua l'émotion de César et ses trébuchements à quelque ivresse bien naturelle, mais souvent mortelle. En se retrouvant chez lui, en revoyant son salon, ses convives, parmi lesquels étaient des femmes habillées pour le bal, tout-à-coup le mouvement héroïque du finale de la grande symphonie de Beethoven éclata

[8] Conard edition, 178-179.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

dans sa tête et dans son coeur. Cette musique idéale rayonna, pétilla sur tous les modes, fit sonner ses clairons dans les méninges de cette cervelle fatiguée, pour laquelle ce devait être le grand finale." [9]

Evidently, then, it is hardly possible to neglect the romance of business, *César Birotteau,* even in a study of the musical taste of Balzac. To express his admiration of Beethoven, both because he has not at his command the technical vocabulary of musical criticism and because, moreover, he lays no claim to being a professional critic, he has recourse to Swedenborg; but that his admiration was real and that he was profoundly affected cannot be denied, since definite evidence of his admiration and of the emotion he had felt appears in his private correspondence. Manifestly, too, we have here some confirmation of the opinion voiced by Zola and shared by other critics,—but as yet not definitely substantiated,—that "Balzac s'est incarné dans son César Birotteau." [10] To his hero, he has not only ascribed some of the commercial experiences he himself had had, but the "*arachnitis*" referred to in his letter of Nov. 14 is to be found also in the description of the apoplexy of Birotteau when the music of Beethoven "fit sonner ses clairons dans les méninges de cette cervelle fatiguée" and in the unexpected appeal to the symphony *en ut mineur* to explain the emotions of the poor *parfumeur* at the ball given to celebrate his nomination in the Legion of Honor.

HUGH S. WORTHINGTON.

Sweet Briar College.

REVIEWS

Religious Lyrics of the XIVth Century. Edited by CARLETON BROWN. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1924.

In this delightful volume the editor is bringing a long task to a felicitous conclusion. For some two decades Professor Brown has been known as a master in the domain of mediaeval religious

[9] Conard edition, 340.

[10] Zola, *le Roman expérimental,* 183; *les Romanciers naturalistes,* 57; cf. also: Le Breton, *Balzac,* 159; Brunetière, *Honoré de Balzac,* 37. The present writer hopes to publish later a study of certain aspects of the question of the autobiographical element in *C. B.*

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

lyric, and the two admired volumes of his *Register*[1] have promptly become a classic of English literary history. Having devoted himself unselfishly to the recondite labor of discovering and registering English religious lyrics, he now delights us by bringing forth a representative selection from the poems themselves in a form that attracts the reader and satisfies the scholar.

No insignificant part of Professor Brown's service is the mere assembling of these poems, which makes possible a comprehensive impression of the pious lyricism of a century. No general reader could, and only an occasional scholar would, obtain this particular survey of religious utterance without the aid of such an editor. A considerable proportion of these poems have previously been seen in print, and some of them have been sympathetically appraised by earlier anthologists and historians; but the scattered texts have never before been so impressively united. Of the sheer convenience of the collection one can scarcely speak too highly.

It must not be inferred, however, that the familiar poems in the volume reappear as mere reprints. They are, as a matter of fact, so thoroughly re-edited that virtually all the texts seem to show notable advances in verbal accuracy, and through the use of manuscripts unpublished hitherto, certain well-known poems now appear in enlarged or substantially altered form. Although without the manuscripts at hand a reviewer cannot presume to pass final judgment upon textual details, one has no hesitation in illustrating Professor Brown's superiority over his predecessors by such examples as the following:

> Hoere wyl and here mockynge thou nome tho to thonk;
> Queme the thoenne, kyng of mylse, oure ofringe of thys song.
> (*Reliquiae Antiquae*, II, 225)
>
> Hoere wyl and here moekynge þou nome þo to þonk;
> Queme þe þoenne, mylsful Kyng, oure ofringe of þys song.
> (Brown, p. 17)
>
> To vader and ek hyre brother,
> So never now other nas.
> (*Reliquiae Antiquae*, II, 227)
>
> To uader and hyre broþer—
> So neuer oþer nas.
> (Brown, p. 18)

[1] *A Register of Middle English Religious and Didactic Verse*, 2 vols, Oxford, 1916, 1920.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

To leve that vel of in bothe thou ever boe woninge.
(*Reliquiae Antiquae.* II, 229)
To leue þat uul of boþe þou euer boe louinge.
(Brown, p. 22)

An example of a poem that Professor Brown has substantially enlarged through his use of fresh manuscripts is that beginning *Ler to louen as y loue þe* (Brown, No. 75). To the three stanzas previously known the editor has added two more. Similarly the well-esteemed *Quia amore langueo* (Brown, No. 132) is now virtually doubled in length by the addition of some six stanzas. Among the additions to this poem appear such appealing lines as these:

Why was I crouned and made a quene?
Why was I called of mercy the welle?
Why shuld an erþly woman bene
So hygh in heuen a-boue aungelle?—

and this significant closing stanza:

Nowe man, haue mynde on me for-euer,
loke on þy loue þus languysshyng;
late vs neuer fro other disseuere,
Myne helpe ys þyne oune, crepe vnder my wynge;
Thy syster ys a quene, þy broþer [ys] a kynge,
Thys heritage ys tayled, sone come þer-to,
Take me for þy wyfe and lerne to synge,
Quia amore langueo.

Most notable of all, however, is the editor's achievement in bringing forth poems not previously known in print,—an achievement that Professor Brown's modesty has restrained him from emphasizing. As a matter of fact, almost one-third of the poems in the volume,—some 41 in a collection of 135,—are now printed for the first time. The importance of this new material would have justified the editor in aiding us to distinguish it more easily. In the absence of positive indications, we can only infer that a poem is new through the absence from the notes of a reference to a previous edition; and we are left to test our inferences by consulting the invaluable *Register*. Since, however, certain poems happen not to be provided with notes, even inferences are sometimes impossible. As they stand in the volume before us, Nos. 68, 73, and 76, for example, in no way disclose that they are fresh additions to the *corpus* of fourteenth-century literature.[3]

[3] It is to be hoped that in his two later volumes of lyrics the editor will

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

But one's inconvenience in distinguishing the fresh material is for ever to be forgotten in gratitude for the quantity, worth, and variety of the new poems themselves. Among the least original of these productions are the translations of hymns, and of a few other pieces, by Friar William Herebert,[3] and the group of similar lyrics collected by Bishop Sheppey.[4] Upon the translations, however, Professor Brown confers a special interest through demonstrating that they were provided for embellishing and enriching the sermons of mediaeval preachers. It is not to be expected that in turning hymns into the vernacular for pulpit use the translators should show notable brilliance of style. Such a rendering of *Conditor alme siderum* as Herebert's (No. 20), however, is both accurate and agreeable enough for its purpose;[5] and the grace of the *Crux fidelis* in Bishop Sheppey's collection (No. 40) prompts me to quote it:

> Steddefast crosse, inmong alle oþer
> þow art a tre mykel of prise,
> in braw<n>che and flore swyl<k> a-noþer
> I ne wot non in wode no rys.
> swete be þe nalys,
> and swete be þe tre,
> and sweter be þe birdyn þat hangis vppon the!

By way of characterizing another group of Professor Brown's new offerings I venture to adopt his own adjective, "curious" (p. xv). We may thus classify, I suppose, such pieces as *How Christ shall Come* (No. 36) and *The Evils of the Time* (No. 39)

include in his notes both a specific indication of the previously unpublished state of each new poem and references to the *Register* for all poems. Between the *Register* and the present volume there appear to be small discrepancies in connection with Nos. 74 (*Reg.*, No. 2706), 125 (*Reg.*, No. 490), and 126 (*Reg.*, No. 1033).

[3] The volume includes fourteen poems from Herebert's (Nos. 12-25), of which seven (Nos. 19-25) are now published for the first time.

[4] The seven poems from Bishop Sheppey's collection (Nos. 35-41) are now published for the first time.

[5] In referring to the original Latin hymns Professor Brown has, I think, not always cited the final critical edition: for *Conditor alme siderum*, *Analecta Hymnica*, Li, 46; for *Crux fidelis* (No. 40), *An. Hymn.*, L, 71; for *Ave Maris Stella* (Nos. 17 and 45), *An. Hymn.*, Li, 140; for *Veni creator spiritus* (Nos. 18 and 44), *An. Hymn.*, L, 193.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

of Bishop Sheppey's collection, and *The Knight of Christ* (No. 125) from the later years of the century. The fanciful nature of such poems may be seen in such lines as the following from *How Christ shall Come:*

> I come vram þe wedlok as a svete spouse, þet habbe my
> wif wiþ me in-nome.
> I come vram viȝt a staleworþe knyȝt, þet myne vo habbe ouercome.
> I come vram þe chepyng as a Riche chapman, þet mankynde
> habbe ibouȝt.
> I Come vram an vncouþe londe as a sely pylegrym, þet ferr
> habbe i-souȝt.

But let no one suppose that the new pieces are chiefly translations and curiosities. The fact is that we are now allowed to read for the first time a substantial body of poems of original expressiveness, charm, and occasional power,—among them the following: *Think, Man, of My Hard Stundes* (No. 3), *All Other Love is like the Moon* (No. 49), *The Tower of Heaven* (No. 50), *The Blessed Virgin's Appeal to the Jews* (No. 60), *Jesus, Man's Champion* (No. 63), *Lovely Tear from Lovely Eye* (No. 69), *A Prayer for Three Boons* (No. 124), *Jesus Pleads with the Worldling* (No. 126), *The Spring under a Thorn* (No. 130). It is from such poems as these that one would choose to quote freely, if space allowed. I content myself with two stanzas from *All Other Love is like the Moon:*

> Al oþer loue is lych þe mone
> þat wext and wanet as flour in plein,
> as flour þat fayret and fawyt sone,
> as day þat scwret and endt in rein.
>
> Al oþer loue y flo for þe;
> tel me, tel me, wer þou lyst?
> 'In marie mylde an fre
> i schal be founde, ak mor in crist.'

Although one inevitably seeks out especially the poems that now appear in print for the first time, one does not fail to perceive that the fresh pieces are inconspicuously distributed among the excellent and the indifferent poems that were already familiar. The reader who looks for such established favorites as *Wynter wakeneþ al my care* and *Nou skrynkeþ rose and lylie flour* will find them (No. 9 and 10) among the poems of the early part of the century; and such accepted pieces as *Christ's Gift to Man* and *This World*

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

fares as a Fantasy appear appropriately in a later chronological position (Nos. 90 and 106). The editor has well accomplished his purpose, "above all, to represent the lyrical development of the century."

The workmanship displayed in the scholarly apparatus of this book is so good that one can scarcely suggest a change without danger of pedantry or captiousness. Any suggestion of mine arises solely from a desire that everything reasonable be done to win for Professor Brown's collections the wide circle of readers that these poems should have. I expect that the success of the volume before us will lead to a new printing in due season; hence minor changes may eventually be possible. Moreover in the volumes for the thirteenth and fifteenth centuries, already announced, slight improvements might conceivably be incorporated. I venture, then, to propose an index of first lines, and a slightly more considerate glossary. Upon the need of the index I hope I need not enlarge. As an improvement in the glossary I plead for a more generous supply of cross-references. As it stands, the glossory is admirable, and for the special student, it is ample. In it, however, the so-called general reader and elementary student,—who will need it most,—will encounter small but irritating difficulties that might easily be removed. The editor who generously assists the reader from *sunne* of the text to the glossarial article under *sinne* might well be equally generous when the search lies between *mende* and *munde*, *woele* and *wele*, *murgest* and *mirie*, or *boute* and *but*.[6]

In closing I venture to assert that all who care for lyrical and truly religious utterance are genuinely grateful to the editor for his past and present offerings. They look forward with animation to the two volumes that are to follow, and to such a general essay on the English religious lyric of three centuries as only Professor Brown is competent to write.

Yale University. KARL YOUNG.

---

[6] One would be glad to know whether Professor Brown is willing to consider aiding certain other paleographers in introducing into the English language the word *expunctuate*, thus making possible the shortening of "dots under *wel* for deletion" (Brown, p. 247) to "*wel* expunctuated," and of "*my* dotted for deletion" (p. 248) to "*my* expunctuated." Although the proposed verb can never become lovely, such editors as Professor Brown might help to make it both reputable and useful.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

A Grammar of the German Language designed for a thoro and practical study of the language as spoken and written to-day. Revised and enlarged. By GEORGE O. CURME. New York, The Macmillan Co., 1922.

Das ausgezeichnete Buch erschien 1905 in erster Auflage, wurde seitdem wiederholt neu gedruckt, und liegt nun seit 1922 in zweiter, stark erweiterter und vielfach verbesserter Auflage vor. Grösseres Format und gedrängterer (aber deutlicher und schöner) Druck ergeben für die neue, ausführlichere Ausgabe etwas kleineren Seitenumfang als für die erste (jetzt 623 S., früher 661 S.). Das Gerüst der Darstellung war schon in der ersten Auflage so wohlüberlegt, dass der Verfasser seine Zusätze und Umformungen überall in die alten Fächer einfügen konnte, so dass die Paragraphen und auch deren Unterabteilungen die gleichen Ziffern tragen heute wie früher.

Die Erweiterungen beziehen sich in den seltensten Fällen auf Vermehrung der Beispiele für schon früher Beobachtetes, sondern bestehen hauptsächlich in Feststellungen von früher noch nicht beobachteten Spracherscheinungen, von Färbungen und Schwankungen der Rede nach Sprachethos und geographischer Verbreitung. Dazu treten neu eingefügte oder umgestaltete historische Noten, Wort- und Wortgruppenlisten (s. z. B. die neuen Listen der Verba mit präpositionalem Objekt: 261, 3 und 262, IV) und gelegentliche Verschiebungen des Materials (zu Anfang der Ausführungen über die Substantivdeklination ist für eine kurze Strecke sogar die alte Paragraphenteilung ins Schwanken gekommen: 63, 64).

Man kann sagen, dass alle, oft tief greifenden Veränderungen, die der Verfasser am Werke vornahm, Besserungen sind, welche von fortgesetzter Beobachtung am gesprochenen und geschriebenen Deutsch, von immer feinerer Einsicht in die sprachlichen Zusammenhänge und kräftigerer Einführung in das Charakteristische Zeugnis geben.

Auch in der neuen Gestalt bleibt das Buch, wie in der alten, deskriptiv: es will nicht normativ sein. Es legt das sprachliche Material in erstaunlicher Vollständigkeit geordnet vor, so wie es in Rede und Schrift zu tatsächlichem Ausdruck kommt. Es ist für englischsprechende grammatisch Gebildete bestimmt. Daher hebt

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

es auch oft die Erscheinungen besonders hervor, über die sich der englischsprechende Mensch wundert oder wundern könnte. Aber es ist diese Betrachtungsweise ebenso für den deutschen Leser ungemein nützlich, der, auch der Grammatiker von Fach, oft Dinge als selbstverständlich gegeben hinnimmt, über die er sich wundern sollte. Auch der Sprachbeflissene, der von Pauls deutscher Grammatik kommt oder von Wilmanns Buch, wird viel aus diesem Buche lernen können, auf vieles aus ihm aufmerksam werden, was er aus jenen so trefflichen und fördersamen Büchern nicht hat erfahren können. Zwischen der ersten und der zweiten Auflage von Curme's Buch liegt die eben genannte Grammatik von Paul. Gewiss hat Curme, der die Literatur durchwegs kennt, wenn er sie auch, gemäss der ganzen Anlage seines Buchs, selten zitiert, auch aus ihr gelernt. Aber man könnte kaum viele Stellen herausfinden, an denen Änderungen der zweiten Auflage durch Pauls Buch direkt beeinflusst sind. Und man wird auch nicht viele finden, an denen solche Änderungen erwünscht wären. Eher könnte man bei Paul manchmal, in der Formenlehre sowohl wie in der Syntax, die Benutzung von Curme's erster Auflage vermissen. So reich ist da die Beobachtung, so scharf die Aufmerksamkeit des Verfassers.

So durchaus deskriptiv, frei von schulmeisterlicher Regelfreude auch die Darlegung Curme's absichtlich gehalten ist, so muss er doch seinen englischen Lesern oft genug sagen, was bei den zahlreichen Schwankungen einzelner sprachlicher Phänomene hauptsächliche oder verbreitetste Übung ist, oder seines Erachtens Aussicht hat die Oberhand zu gewinnen. Hier kann man ja wohl, besonders als Süddeutscher, oft anderer Ansicht sein als der Verfasser des Buches. Die Schwierigkeiten, die diese Schwankungen der Darstellung bereiten, sind gross. Wie vieles ist ausser der geographischen Verbreitung da noch zu beachten und zu bewerten: lässige Umgangssprache, sorgfältiger und gepflegter Ausdruck, poetisierender und archaisierender Ton, erregte, temperamentvolle oder ruhige Rede; bloss gesprochen, bloss geschrieben; zu wem und von wem gesprochen, für wen und von wem geschrieben. Die Konstatierung ist schon mühvoll, aber noch leichter als die Wertung. Der Verfasser hat auf all diese Färbungen oft genug hingewiesen und es wäre nicht einmal zu wünschen, dass er es noch

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

öfter getan hätte; denn die Gefahr zu verwirren und von eins ins andere zu geraten ist da gross. Einer Wertung geht er, der kein Regelbuch schreiben will, gern aus dem Wege. Aber es gibt doch effektiv falsche Wendungen, die nicht einfach als gebraucht zu anderm Auffälligen gestellt werden können, wenn man sie auch gedruckt nachweisen kann: "Dass sich verbreitete Geheimnis" und "die sich eingebildete Erfindung" ist nicht deutsch, nicht deutsch der gebildeten Menschen von heute trotz Goethe und Grimm (183 B). Derartiges hätte sich ja von dorther einbürgern können und wäre dann eben deutsch geworden; aber das ist eben nicht geschehen. Kein Deutscher darf heute so schreiben und so zu reden liegt ihm erst recht ferne. Und wenn von Curme anderes der Art aus Quellen wie die *Augsburger Post* oder irgend einer Morgenzeitung belegt wird, so haben wir es da mit sprachlichen Schnurren zu tun, die Leute sich leisten, welche, ohne sprachliches Verantwortungsgefühl, auch noch das Sprachgefühl ihrer mündlichen Rede verlieren, sobald sie zur Feder greifen, entweder aus lauter Respekt vor dem Geschriebenen oder aus Respektslosigkeit für ihr tintiges Gewerbe. Wenn Rud. Bartsch (s. 94, 3 A, a) schreibt "ein gut Stück echt menschlicher Schwäche und österreichischem Behagen," so ist das nicht österreichische Vorliebe für den Dativ in der Apposition, sondern Schlamperei im Ausdruck. Er begann mit "ein gut Stück" *cum genetivo* und setzte fort als ob er begonnen hätte mit "ein gut Stück von." Auch in einem "wegen Hagens, diesem jungen Laster" der Ebner-Eschenbach sieht Curme diesen österreichischen Appositionsdativ (255, III, 1 A, k). Aber die gute Ebner hatte, als sie in "wegen Hagens" "wegen" mit dem Genetiv konstruiert hatte, ihrem Bedürfnis nach hochdeutsch und der Erinnerung an ihren Sprachlehrer schon genuggetan. Nie im Leben hatte sie "wegen Hagens" gesprochen, sondern "wegen Hagen" oder "wegen dem Hagen" und das lebt auch in ihrem sprachlichen Unterbewusstsein und so fährt sie fort: "wegen Hagens, diesem jungen Laster." Das sind Anakoluthe, die die Stilistik, nicht die Grammatik berühren. Aber derlei ist doch gegenüber der Fülle an richtig Beobachtetem und auch richtig Gefühltem und Gewertetem verschwindend wenig zu finden in dem Buch, das auch unser einer nie ohne Belehrung und Anregung weglegen wird, wenn er auch nur ein paar Seiten darin aufmerksam gelesen hat.

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

In der ersten Auflage hat Curme der Aussprache von Berlin die Zukunft prognostizirt und daher diese auch den phonetischen Darlegungen zu Grunde gelegt. Heute, nach dem Krieg, ist er darin schwankend geworden und berücksichtigt stärker als früher die Bühnensprache, wie sie in Siebs Buch festgelegt erscheint. Ich meine freilich, dass einiges berlinische (so das spirantische *g* in In- und Auslaut, die kurzen Vocale in "Tag, Grab, Glas, Zug" u. s. w.) auch früher kaum Aussicht auf Allgemeingeltung gehabt haben. Wenn Curme auch heute noch das uvulare *r* als das eigentlich deutsche *r* bezeichnet und ihm die Zukunft gibt, so möchte ich zweifeln. Das ist doch sicher, dass kein Mensch sich uvulares *r* absichtlich aneignet, der ein stolzes Zungen- *r* zu sprechen gewohnt ist; wohl aber wird es viele geben, die aus Sprachkultur ihr uvulares *r* bewusst zugunsten des Zungen- *r* aufgeben. Das spricht jedesfalls doch eher für die Zukunft der lingualen Artikulation, deren Verbreitung im deutschen Sprachgebiet, glaub ich, auch grösser ist als Curme meint. So möchte ich auch Fremden, die in ihrer Sprache linguales *r* haben, nicht raten sich um das uvulare zu bemühen wenn sie deutsch sprechen.

Graz. KONRAD ZWIERZINA.

Goethes Faust, kritisch durchgesehen, eingeleitet und erläutert von ROBERT PETSCH. Leipzig, Bibliographisches Institut. 628 S. 6 Mark.

Für Goethe gilt, was er einmal über Shakespeare niedergeschrieben hat: Es ist über Shakespeare schon so viel gesagt, dass es scheinen möchte, als wäre nichts mehr zu sagen übrig, und doch ist das die Eigenschaft des Geistes, dass er den Geist ewig anregt. Das gilt gar für die Faustdichtung, diese Bibel des Goetheschen Wesens, die die Entwicklung von sechzig Jahren seines Daseins in sich birgt, auch verbirgt. Der Untersuchungen und Erläuterungen sind so viele, dass selbst der Berufsforscher die Masse schwer übersieht. Der Professor der Hamburger Universität Petsch hat sich seit Jahren darüber kritisch ausgesprochen, eigene Beobachtungen zugefügt. Nun trägt er auf eng gedruckten achtzig Seiten knapper Anmerkungen von Vers zu Vers die wertvolle einschlägige Literatur sichtend, zustimmend, widerlegend, berichtigend, ergän-

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

zend zusammen und gibt so die Anregung zu eindringendem Studium des unerschöpflichen Werkes; ein gewissenhafter Führer, der auch dem Erfahrenen Übersehenes oder zu wenig Gewürdigtes und oft Neues zeigt, der dem Suchenden die schwierigen Wege öffnet. Hiemit ist Petsch mehr als alle bisherigen Ausleger ein zuverlässiger Berater. Was der mehr Geniessende als einbohrende Leser an Wort- und Sacherklärung bedarf, ist überdies in Fussnoten dem Texte beigegeben, so dass auch ihm die Ausgabe als bequeme Hilfe zu raschem Verständnis willkommen sein muss.

Die Einleitung holt weit aus, beginnt bei alten Sagen von Magiern und Teufelsbündlern. Auch dazu ist Petsch durch seine Ausgabe des ältesten Faustbuchs, der er erhellende Einleitung und vervollständigende Anhänge beigegeben hat (Halle 1911), gründlich vorbereitet. Und durch seinen erläuternden Druck der Lessingschen Faustdichtung (Heidelberg 1911), hat er sich und uns die nächste Vorgeschichte des Goetheschen Dramas dargelegt. An dieses selbst tritt er nicht mit der modischen Forderung, die Einheitlichkeit zu erweisen, heran, er will nicht für Widersprüche und Lücken blind machen, erklärt aus der Entstehung die bei so lang gedehnter, unter Lebens- und Kunsterfahrungen sich verwandelnder Ausarbeitung unvermeidlichen Unebenheiten, findet den Zusammenhang der Absichten und Ziele, den ich noch mehr im künstlerischen Gestalten als im philosophischen Spekulieren suchen möchte. Der *Faust* ist ein biographisches Drama mit Konflikten, nicht mit einem Hauptkonflikt; so, wie das Leben der meisten Menschen verläuft. Der erste Teil spielt in der Enge des privaten Lebens, der zweite in der Weite der höheren Regionen, was Goethe oft betont hat. Aber die kleine und die grosse Welt werden mit Bezug auf einander durchmessen. Zauberhafte Veränderungen geben die Einschnitte: der Hexentrunk verjüngt zur Liebe, durch den Geistergesang wird die Erinnerung an Gretchen eingelullt, die Luftfahrt leitet zu Helena, die Wolkenfahrt entrückt sie und weckt das Gedächtnis an Gretchen. Der dem ersten Teil, dem Mikrokosmus vorgeschobene Prolog im Himmel deutet vor auf den Schluss des zweiten, des Makrokosmus, auf die Himmelfahrt. Der grübelnde Monolog des ersten Teiles mit dem Pakt verkehrt sich zu den Taten des vierten und fünften Aktes mit der Lösung des Paktes. Die Gretchentragödie wiederholt sich in der höheren Region der Helenatragödie, Mutter und Kind gehen ver-

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

loren. Eingeschoben ist beidemale eine Walpurgisnacht, das erstemal gegen den Schluss, das zweite gegen den Anfang. Denn der Bau ist durchaus chiastisch, umkehrend. Den ersten Teil beherrscht Faust, dann Gretchen, den zweiten erst Helena, dann Faust. Die Responsionen des Aufbaus sind bis ins Einzelne zu verfolgen, die künstlerische Ordnung bindet die Vielheit des Stofflichen zum einheitlichen Ganzen. Das könnte deutlicher betont sein. Wie offen aber doch des Herausgebers Blick auch dem Dichterischen steht, lehren die zahlreichen feinsinnigsten Bemerkungen über den Stil der Sprache, den Rhythmus der Verse; daran wird so recht klar, wie vollendet sich Wort und Takt dem Inhalt anpassen. Auch auf diesem schwierigen Boden versagt Petsch' Leitung nicht.

Die Verlagshandlung hat das Buch mit dem ihr stets eigenen Geschmack ausgestattet, auch die kleinste Schrift ist scharf und rein.

BERNHARD SEUFFERT.

Graz.

Oeuvres de François Villon, édition critique avec notices et Glossaire par LOUIS THUASNE. Paris: Auguste Picard, 1923. 3 vols.

Le Poesie de François Villon, commento di FERDINANDO NERI. *Scrittori di Francia,* Vol. I. Turin: Giovanni Chiantore, 1923. xxxii + 208 pp.

The three volume edition of Villon by Thuasne represents an extraordinary amount of erudition. The first volume contains an *Introduction* (i-viii), *Notice Biographique* (1-77), *Examen de l'Oeuvre* (78-130) and a *Bibliographie* (130-146), followed by the text. The bibliography lists all the editions of Villon with their full title pages, but no articles about him or his work. The entire second volume (332 pp.) as well as 280 pages of the third is devoted to a commentary in fine print upon the *Lais, Testament,* and *Ballades.* The rest of the third volume contains the sources for the Diomedes episode and for the *Ballade des Dames de temps jadis,* cited and discussed in full, followed by the jargon poems and glossaries and indices to the entire work.

M. Thuasne has shown original scholarship throughout. His

Digitized by Google — Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

text is based upon an independent collation of the manuscripts, and he has not hesitated to adopt readings which are not those of the Longnon-Foulet edition.[1] Sometimes his departures from the best manuscripts C and F are unfortunate. He has not, however, made many changes. Taking the Longnon-Foulet third edition as the *textus receptus,* I shall list here M. Thuasne's more important changes. He has frequently adopted different spellings, but these are of little consequence.

Les Lais. v. 45. L. F. Sa grace, il me convient partir; Th. Sa grace, *ne me departir.*—v. 147. L. F. Pesches, poires, sucre, figuier; Th. Perches, poussins au blanc mengier;—v. 173. L. F. riblis; Th. rubis. This last reading of Thuasne's is totally unnecessary as Villon uses elsewhere *ribler* and *ribleurs.*

Le Testament. v. 10. L. F. s'il n'est en friche; Th. si n'est en friche.—v. 272. L. F. si la pense; Th. si le pense.—v. 331. L. F. Archipiades; Th. Archipiada.—v. 390. L. F. aussi bien meurt que cilz servans; Th. que filz, servans.—v. 728. L. F. a ses loix de tout dire; Th. a ses hoirs doit tout dire.—v. 1143. L. F. en s. (c'est bien fait); Th. en s. s'est bien fait.—v. 1381. L. F. per; Th. past.—v. 1606. L. F. se prent, "c'est Antecrist"; Th. se prent cest Antecrist—v. 1648. L. F. aulx; Th. os.[2]

Les Ballades, XIV, v. 21. L. F. buez; Th. debuez.

I have cited only those variants which make a serious difference in the interpretation of a passage. In each case M. Thuasne attempts to justify his readings with interesting citations from Villon's predecessors and contemporaries. In view of the *brulare bigod* of T. 1585 M. Thuasne divides the *Gogo* of T. 1614 and calls it the English imperative *Go Go.* This I believe to be justifiable. M. Sainéan has pointed out that *brulare bigod* was probably Scotch.[3] Should we not therefore expect such an imperative to be *Gā Gā,* as Villon's acquaintance with English must have been derived from the Scotch archers at Louis XI's court? I do not consider such an objection to be of much consequence.

In the extensive and exhaustive commentary the editor has not been as judicious as in his text. What has the greater part of

[1] This edition scrupulously reproduces the readings of C for the *Lais* and F for the *Testament,* following rigidly Bédier's injunction to change nothing found in the best MS. that can possibly be supported.

[2] This is unfortunate, for *os* then rhymes with itself in v. 1650.

[3] *La Langue de Rabelais,* II, 13. Both Sainéan and Foulet have *brelare,* not *brulare.*

4

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

those six hundred and twelve pages to do with Villon? M. Thuasne with his vast erudition and immense store of facts has been guilty of all the faults which we have seen in his other works. As M. Sainéan says[4] of his *Villon et Rabelais* (1911), "Le travail montre les procédés excessifs de l'auteur dans sa critique comparative des sources. Un très grand nombre de ses rapprochements sont illusoires ou faits au petit bonheur. Aucun n'est concluant."

The effect is much the same here. With the words of Villon as a key list, we are given a veritable mine of facts and references from Horace, Virgil, Cicero, St. Augustine, Dante, Chaucer, Chrétien de Troyes and many others. Especial use is made of the *Roman de la Rose,* which is to be approved, though not all the parallels he suggests are well-founded. The number of citations from obscure chronicles and works on civilization, etc., are amazing. Starting with *Jehanne,* T. 1344, we are given a series of references to the expression *faire la beste à deux dos.* Verse 1426, which contains the word *juive,* is the occasion for four and a half pages of fine print dealing with the treatment of the Jews in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries. As a note to T. 1700 we find three and a half pages on the *fête des fous.* Verse 1708 suggests six and a half pages devoted to the *jongleurs,* though M. Thuasne omits the most important reference of all, Faral's *les Jongleurs en France au Moyen Age* (1910) which discusses (Ch. II) all that is here said and more.

There are a few, though very few, notes which add nothing whatsoever to our knowledge. In the note to Ballade I, v. 19 the editor says, "Au moyen age on se tordait les poings et on battait des mains en signe de deuil ou de violent chagrin." He then quotes Chrestien de Troyes and others to prove this point. I myself still make exactly these same motions and probably each and every obscure individual in the time of Cicero did the same.

For the crux *de Tusca* in T. 1194 the editor argues in favor of *de Turquant,* lieutenant criminel at Paris, but one can hardly suppose that the *lieutenant criminel* would have to use violent means to secure the favors of a woman belonging to old frere Baude. Furthermore, would the people of the Châtelet have had any right to say whether frere Baude was to encourage his libertine

[4] *La Langue de Rabelais,* I, 4, n. 2.

Digitized by Google | Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

tastes or not? It was ecclesiastical authority which would come to *ribler* with frere Baude his *caige vert.* Line 1194 may well have read originally,

Que le tuscā et ses gens d'armes.

One has only to write this out in a fifteenth century hand to see how, the final nasal lost through carelessness, *letusca* was only intelligible when considered as a proper name with the *le* copied *de.* That it was unintelligible at an early date is shown by the number of variants erroneously made in fifteenth century copies. This Italian may well have been one of the men of arms employed by the *officialité* or ecclesiastical court at Paris, some broken down *condottiere.* He might even have been the representative of the Pope, the nuncio, who dwelt close at hand in the Hotel de Cluny, for the Carmes were an important order and there had recently been an attempt to reform them (see Champion, vol. I).

I have verified many of M. Thuasne's references and I have found very few inaccuracies. The Braun map of Paris (I, 12, n. 4) is usually dated 1530 and not 1509. In I, 65, n. 1 there is a reference to Poésies div. XVI, *ballade de l'appel.* This ballad is no. XV in the order in which Thuasne gives them. In the same way I, 65, n. 3, gives the *ballade des pendus* as XIII. It is XIV in this edition. Line 294 of the *Lais* has *moîs* for *mois.* In v. 9, Ballade I, I can understand *maint jeune hom* or *maint jeunes homs* but I believe *maint jeune homs,* which is the expression found, must be a misprint; I should add an *s* to *jeune.* Verse 1293 of the *Testament* reads *trop fort il est* while *trop forte elle est* is supported in the note, III, 345. Obviously we should have *elle* for *il* in the text. There are a few other errors, but they are insignificant, if we consider the size of the work.

I have found every word of these three volumes fascinating. They are certainly capable of giving a number of pleasant hours to any scholar interested in Villon and the fifteenth century. For him, however, who is reading Villon for the first, second, or even third time, they will possibly be bewildering through the abundance of digressions. Then again M. Thuasne assumes that the reader has a satisfactory knowledge of the topography of Old Paris. I do not believe that this edition can be said to equal for clarity and ease such a combination as the Longnon-Foulet text plus Pierre Champion's *Villon, sa Vie et ses Oeuvres.*

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

The attractive octavo volume of Neri's is by no means as pretentious as the work of M. Thuasne. The text is that of the Longnon-Foulet, 2nd edition, and the material for the notes is for the most part culled with care and patience from the works and articles of P. Champion, G. Paris, Longnon, Schwob, etc., and cited in brief. He does, however, present some original material. He also is keen to find similarities in thought and wording in Dante, in Villon's contemporaries, and among 19th century lyric poets, Verlaine, Théodore de Banville, etc. His point of view is that of the literary critic rather than that of the historian or lexicographer. These parallels are given moderately in sober judgment. The real value of the edition lies in the bibliography, which has been brought together with care and skill (xxiii-xxxii). Whereas Thuasne merely lists the editions, Foulet (3rd ed. 1923) only some forty-five editions and articles, here there are ten pages of bibliography with a running commentary. We are given among others a list of the more important articles in Italian (p. xxix sq.) devoted to Villon. While as Neri says, "Gli studî italiani sul Villon non sono molto ricchi e non hanno finora aggiunto nulla alla conoscenza del poeta," we are nevertheless interested in taking account of the writings of V. Morello, A. Parino, and others. The introduction proper is not very valuable. It is chiefly a discussion in an obscure style as to whether the ballads interspersed throughout the *Testament* were written separately or not. There is also a brief treatment of Boileau's criticism of Villon (*Art Poet.* I, v. 117 sq.). Nothing new is brought to bear upon these matters.

URBAN T. HOLMES.

University of Missouri.

CORRESPONDENCE

ANOTHER FRENCH SOURCE OF BODMER

In previous articles published in various journals I have already discussed several of the sources of Bodmer's *Noah,* among them Mme. de Graffigny's *Lettres d'une Péruvienne.*[1] But Bodmer laid at least two other French authors under contribution for his biblical epic. One of these was Bernard Le Bovier de Fontenelle

[1] Cf. my article *A French Source of Bodmer's Noah* in the Philological Quarterly, vol. 3 (1924).

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

(1657-1757), in whose *Entretiens sur la pluralité des mondes*[2] we read on page 160:

"Et toi, crois-tu avoir ressemblé à un homme, quand tu t'es plaint d'avoir passé une nuit sans dormir, à cause que parmi les feuilles de roses dont ton lit était semé, il y en avait eu une sous toi qui s'était pliée en deux?"

which substantially parallels Bodmer's

Söhne des Chemos, der männliche Geist ist in Wollust zerflossen,
Krank ist die Kraft des Körpers, entnervt durch fleischliche Werke.
Wann in dem Bette bestreut mit Rosen, sich eines der Blätter
Faltet, so fühlts die (*sic*) empfindliche Nerv.
(*Noah* ed. 1765, p. 56)

On page 77 of the *Entretiens* the author writes

"Il y a des reines en Orient et en Afrique qui ont publiquement des sérails d'hommes"

which apparently is the source of the passage—Bodmer is describing the moral depravity prevailing in the land of Lud—

das Ehbett
Ist da mit keinen Gesetzen beschränkt, wollüstige Frauen
Halten von Jünglingen Harams." (*Noah*, p. 56)

When in the *Entretiens*[3] we came upon the passage
". . . . . ta ville de Sibaris sera décriée à jamais par la mollesse de ses habitants, qui avaient banni les coqs de peur d'en etre éveillés. . . . ."

we note that this is paralleled by the same trait in the Bodmerian Sybarites, for of them we are told

Wo am Damna Calmuna erhöht im Königesstolz sitzt,
Fanden wir unter dem westlichen Tor die Ältesten sitzen;
Einer mit grauem Haupt trug vor, man sollte den Hähnen,
Den Verderbern des Morgenschlafs Calmuna verbieten.[4]

Fontenelle in the *Entretiens* makes frequent reference to the supposed inhabitants of other planets, so on pages 5, 30 ff., 55, 72, 75. In his *Noah* Bodmer likewise refers to the planetary world, for in the course of his story he assigns various beings to heavenly bodies.[5] To guard against a possible misapprehension, however,

[2] I have before me the Paris edition of 1811.
[3] Cf. page 160.
[4] Cf. the *Noah*, edition of 1752, l. 601 ff.
[5] Cf. e. g., the *Noah*, p. 325. Klopstock in his *Messias* (v, 205 ff.) introduces the same idea, probably having derived it from Mrs. Rowe's *Letters from the Dead to the Living* in which we read (Letter V) "The inhabitants of this (*sc.* planetary world) which I am describing, stood their probation, and are confirmed in their original rectitude, ... they are exempt from all evil, blest to the height of their faculties and conceptions: and are privileged with immortality." Hamel in his annotated edition of

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

it will be proper to add at this point that not only the *Entretiens* but several others of Bodmer's sources introduce the same subject.

Fontenelle's passage—

". . . . . il y a en Amérique des oiseaux qui sont si lumineux dans les ténèbres, qu'on s'en peut servir pour lire." [6]

probably contributed to Bodmer's following two passages concerning the dove of peace. The first passage reads

Einsmals siehet er (*sc.* Sem) auf, und siehet auf einem der Zweige
Eine sitzende Taube, sie leuchtet' im Glanze der Iris
Höher, als meliböischer Purpur; die Schatten des Ölbaums
Strahlten von ihrem Lichte mit ungewöhnlichem Schimmer.
Unter den Flügeln, die jüngst mit Sem die Arche gewohnet,
Hatte keiner mit solchem Schmucke der Farben geleuchtet.[7]

In the second passage in question Bodmer represents the luminosity as due to a feather which the angel plucked from his own wing and placed upon the breast of the bird and thereafter, as we learn,

die leuchtende Feder
Breitet den himmlischen Glanz auf alle Federn der Taube.[8]
(*Noah*, p. 350)

As stated above a third French work was drawn upon by Bodmer; indeed as a source of the *Noah* it is of greater importance than either Mme. de Graffigny's *Lettres d'une Péruvienne* or Fontenelle's *Entretiens sur la pluralité des mondes.* With this I intend to deal in another article.

C. H. IBERSHOFF.

University of Iowa.

---

the *Messias* seems unaware of Klopstock's indebtedness in this matter to Mrs. Rowe's work. Bodmer in his *Briefe über Joseph und Zuleika* (1754) refers on page 129 to the very same one of Mrs. Rowe's *Letters from the Dead*, viz. the fifth, from which the passage above was cited. The poet Young, I may add, refers to a similar

unterrestrial sphere,
Where Mortal, untranslated, never strayed.
(Cf. *Night Thoughts*, IX, 1752 f.)

[6] Cf. the *Entretiens*, page 101.

[7] This passage owes something also to Milton, for cf. *Paradise Lost*, XI, ll. 240-244:

Over his lucid arms
A military vest of purple flowed,
Livelier than Meliboean . . . . .
. . . . . Iris had dipt the woof.
(*Noah*, page 349)

[8] As a bit of confirmatory evidence to show that Bodmer knew some of the works of Fontenelle, I may state that in his letter to Hess, January 16th, 1752, I find what appears to be a reminiscence of several passages in Fontenelle's *Dialogues des Morts* (pp. 212 and 301); the *Dialogues* are included in the same volume with the *Entretiens.* For the Bodmerian letter in question cf. Josephine Zehnder: *Pestalozzi*, page 497.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

ON THE MEANING OF THE WORD 'LAKE' IN MARLOWE'S *Edward II*

In the latter part of Marlowe's *Edward II* the king is confined in an underground dungeon, which is, we are told,

the sincke
Wherein the filthe of all the castell falles,[1]

and inl. 2433, when Edward is being handed over to the tender mercies of Lightborne, Matrevis says to the murderer, "here is the keyes, this is the lake." The word 'lake' has by some editors been emended to 'lock'; others, retaining 'lake,' understand it of the moat of the castle, a meaning which hardly makes good sense, or else, purely *metaphorically,* of the dungeon, a figure of speech which is, to say the least, forced. In my edition I pointed out that it was possible to take the word literally as meaning a dungeon, and I cited from *NED* certain bits of evidence which, though inconclusive, supported that view. I think the following evidence will make it incontrovertible.

Notice the meanings of the word 'lacus' in Lewis and Short: a basin, tank, tub, or vat; a large body of water; a large reservoir for water; a hole in which lime is slacked; a bin for pulse in a granary; a den or cave for lions; finally, the pit, the place of the dead.

The expression 'in lacum captivitatis cecidit' occurs in Rolle's *Incendium Amoris,* ed. Deanesley, cap. 24.

In *The Castle of Perseverance* is the following line, of which the meaning is clear:

ayl deth comyth four dolfully & loggyth hy*m* i*n* a lake,[2]

and the word occurs again toward the end of the play with the same meaning.

'Lake' occurs four times in Sackville's *Induction.*[3] On p. 120 it has its ordinary meaning. On p. 102, it probably means 'dungeon,' or 'pit'; more probably is this the meaning when the passage is taken in connection with the description on p. 121. From pp. 107 f. I quote several lines that make the meaning in this part of the poem perfectly clear:

Here enter'd we, and yeding forth, anon
  An horrible loathly lake we might discern,
  As black as pitch, that cleped is *Avern.*
A deadly gulf; where nought but rubbish grows. . . . .
  Hither we come; whence forth we still did pace. . . . .
And, first, within the porch and jaws of hell,

[1] Ll. 2463-4 of my edition of *Edward II,* 1914; 2504-5 of Brooke's *Works of Marlowe,* 1910.
[2] *Tudor Facsimile Texts,* 1908, fol. 155; cf. fol. 191, 'to helle lake.'
[3] *Works of Sackville,* ed. Sackville-West, 1859, pp. 102, 107, 108, 120.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

> Sat deep *Remorse of Conscience.* . . . .
> Next saw we *Dread.* . . . .
> And next, within the entry of this lake,
> Sat fell *Revenge.*

The word occurs at least three times in Gascoigne's *Droomme of Doomes day.*[4] On p. 268 we read: "For in hell ther is no redemption. Therefore sinners shalbe gathered together into the lake & shalbe shut into prison." There is nothing in the context to suggest that 'lake' means anything other than dungeon. On p. 391 it occurs twice: "For what a thinge is it to be for ever enclosed in the pryson of hell, in the myddest of unquencheable fyre, in a moste fylthie stinckinge and lothesome lake," etc.; "a lake full of all myserie, yea most brymfull of all desperation, trouble, crying, and howlyng, boyling, wth a most skalding fyre. etc." The meaning in the first of these instances seem reasonably clear; in the second, the words 'boiling' and 'scalding' perhaps suggest that Gascoigne is thinking of liquid fire, and hence of a lake of fire; yet in the same sentence he speaks of the souls as walking in midst of this fire, and of their being racked and tormented, so that the 'lake' is a place full of all sorts of torments, boiling and scalding fire being one of them.

Even more satisfactory for our present purpose is a passage in Hooker, *Ecclesiastical Polity,* v, xliv: "which maketh some show of giving countenance to their error, who think that the faithful which departed this life before the coming of Christ, were never till then made partakers of joy, but remained all in that place which they term the 'Lake of the Fathers.'"

There seems no reason, then, to suppose that Marlowe in *Edward* II is using 'lake' otherwise than as meaning a pit or underground dungeon, and a passage in *Tamburlaine*[5] may be quoted to confirm this view:

> And traueile hedlong to the lake of hell.

WILLIAM DINSMORE BRIGGS.

Stanford University.

SOME DETAILS OF THE SONNET REVIVAL

I

Mr. G. F. Evans's interesting discovery of a sonnet on Death published in 1735 (*MLN,* XXXIX, 184-85), should of course be considered in connection with Havens's definitive treatment of the sonnet revival (*The Influence of Milton on English Poetry,* Cambridge, 1922, ch. XIX, especially 488-89, and Bibliography IV),

[4] *The Glasse of Governement and Other Works,* ed. Cunliffe, 1910.
[5] Pt. II, 3526.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

where Gosse's sweeping statement about the absolute dearth of sonnets from the Restoration to 1750 is completely refuted. Havens pushes back the Petrarchan-Miltonic revival to 1738 (cf. p. 489); the sonnet of 1735, if published as soon as written, must be about the last of the sporadic instances that precede the new development.

II

Bishop Percy is known to have written three Spenserian sonnets. Miss Rinaker (*MLN.*, xxxv, 56-58) points out that one of these appeared in Lloyd's *St. James's Magazine* in 1764, as 'by the Rev. Mr. Thomas Piercy,' with the title *A Sonnet, After the manner of Spencer. Addressed to a Lady;* and was afterwards included in Pearch's *Collection,* under a different title. It may be added that this same sonnet had appeared already in the *Universal Visiter and Memorialist,* 1756, p. 240, signed 'P.'; and is thus contemporaneous with that other sonnet of Percy's which appears in Pearch's 1770 edition, Miss Rinaker reports, under the caption *Occasioned by Leaving B—R—N, July, 1755* (the place-name is *B—X—N* in the 1783 edition, III, 298); but which was also published in the *Universal Visiter,* 1756, pp. 330-31, signed 'P.,' with a somewhat different title: *A Sonnet. Occasioned by leaving Bath, June 1755. Addressed to the Misses H . . .* Thus Percy published these two trifles a good deal earlier than has been supposed.

III

Havens finds that Thomas Edwards, "the real father of the eighteenth-century sonnet," seems to have influenced directly only a small group of followers, Susannah Highmore, Hester Mulso Chapone, and William Mason. Edwards personally instructed and helped Miss Highmore in writing sonnets, as her *Sonnet to T. Edwards, Esq.,* dated 1749, tells us (Rowland Freeman, *Kentish Poets,* Canterbury, 1821, II, 285); and Edwards in return reproached her for her diffidence in publishing (*ibid.*, II, 384). Another member of this coterie was John Duncombe, who married Susannah Highmore. Duncombe wrote at least two sonnets, one *To the Memory of Mrs. Leapor,* published in the *Poetical Magazine; or, The Muses Monthly Companion,* 1764, p. 259; and one *To Thomas Edwards, Esq., loc. cit.*, p. 260 (reprinted in Freeman, II, 379). The second is worth quoting as an early criticism of the sonnet cult, and as illustrating Edwards's curious allegation that he worked primarily under the influence of Spenser (cf. Havens, 493-94):

Though thro' the paths that Ennius trod before
  Great Maro stray'd, he smooth'd the rugged way.
  No antique phrase obscur'd his courtly lay,
No dross was blended with his sterling ore.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

From Dryden's polish'd strains old Chaucer's lore
Derives new lustre; pleas'd we there survey
Each mist dispers'd that skreen'd his peerless ray,
And at our fleeting language grieve no more.
Why then dost thou, great Spenser's genuine son,
Too fondly emulous, that vestment wear,
Which in Eliza's court adorn'd thy sire?
From sonnet's durance freed, no longer shun
The public paths; so shall each artless fair
Seeing approve, and knowing thee admire.

This is doubtless the "Sonnet to Mr. Edwards, disapproving his imitation of the style of Spenser," which Duncombe sent to Richardson on August 16, 1754 (*Correspondence of Samuel Richardson.* London, 1804, II, 294). "Whether the author approves it or not," wrote Duncombe, "it speaks my real thoughts." Richardson prudently refused to send Edwards the sonnet (*Ibid.*, II, 297).

ALAN D. MCKILLOP.

The Rice Institute.

A FORGOTTEN SONNET OF LOPE DE VEGA

For the next biographer of Lope some slight interest may attach to the following sonnet:

De Lope De Vega Carpio, a Iuan Antonio / de Herrera Temiño /

Soneto.

La verde yedra al olmo antiguo asida,
Con tantos laberintos la guarnece,
Que sus estremos exceder parece,
Siendo en sus verdes ramas sostenida.

Tal, Iuan Antonio, vuestra tierna vida
De vuestro padre entre los braços crece,
Que ya a su estremo, el de su ingenio ofrece
Anticipada en el estar florida.

O verdes años bienauenturados,
Que bien se ve que os tiene el docto Herrera
Sobre las fuerças de su ingenio graue?

Creced juntos los dos tan abraçados,
Que nunca la villana embidia fiera
Tal yedra corte, ni tal olmo acabe.

It occurs in a rare volume entitled: LVSVS PUERITIAE / IOANNIS ANTONII / DE HERRERA TEMIÑO / Madritensis, in celebri Salmanticensi / Academia vtriusque Iuris / studiosi / LIBRI TRES / AD PHILIPPUM III. HISPA- / *niarum & Indiarum Regem potentissimum.* / Anno 1599 / Cvm Privilegio / Madrîti, Apud Ludouicum Sanchez. // 8°. 8; 54; 2 sheets. Madrid, *Biblioteca Nacional* R. 10456. Cortina book-plate.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

Lope's verses, at the head of the little volume, are accompanied by four Latin epigrams, signed by the author's father, Dr. Christopher Pérez de Herrera, well known as a seventeenth-century expert on mendicity,[1] Father Lud. de la Cerda, S. J., Hier. Ramirus, and Dr. Anton Daza of Madrigal, and by a Spanish sonnet of Alonzo de Salas Barbadillo. Lope, Daza, and Salas Barbadillo were all friends of the young man's father, in whose honor all three at one time or another wrote commendatory poems.[2]

Lope mentions the son in the *Laurel de Apolo,*[3] and before that had spoken of him with particular friendliness in the *Trezena Parte* of his *Comedias* as of a man "cuyas virtudes y letras conozco desde sus mas tiernos anos."[4] Rodríguez Marín[5] brings detailed information about this youthful prodigy, whom the Law snatched from Helicon. However, neither Rodríguez Marín nor Pérez Pastor appears to know the volume here described. As the former points out, D. Aureliano Fernández-Guerra confused Juan Antonio de Herrera with a Sevillan of the same name, and Pérez Pastor, while once mentioning Joannes Antonius de Herrera Temiño in his index, does not know that he is one with the Juan Antonio de Herrera mentioned further on.[6] It may be added that López de Sedano, reprinting Herrera Temiño's *Epitafio a Celestina*[7] had already correctly guessed his identity.

JOSEPH E. GILLET.

Bryn Mawr College.

The Mirror of Knighthood

. . . . "and that true Spanish story
The Mirror of Knighthood, which I have read often,
Read feelingly, nay more, I doe believe in it."
(Massinger, *The Guardian*, I, 2)

Since I have been put on the retired list, I was obliged to send my books to the Storage Rooms where they are of very difficult access. This will help to explain why I did not learn of Dr. Gray's paper[1] till today when the fifty-eighth volume of *Shakespeare-Jahrbuch* reached me. I am now jotting down a few words in reply to his criticisms. Dr. Becker's claim that I did not know of Dorer's paper while writing my 'Probable Source' is inconsistent with

[1] For more information on the father, and some details about the son, see the indices of Pérez Pastor, *Bibliografía Madrileña*, Madrid, 1891-1907.
[2] Cf. Pérez Pastor, nrs. 592 and 1561.
[3] *Silva* VII, *BAAEE*, XXXVIII, 214.
[4] Madrid, 1620, *ap.* Pérez Pastor, nr. 1704.
[5] *Pedro Espinosa*, Madrid, 1907, 176 sqq.
[6] Cf. nos. 592 and 677.
[7] *Parnaso español*, Madrid, 1768-1778, LX, 154, and *ibid.*, *Notas*, p. XXV.
[1] *Modern Language Notes*, XXXV, 321.

Digitized by Google · Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

facts as I have shown elsewhere.[2] It is not clear to me why Dr. Gray does not mention the parallel to the Caliban subplot I reprinted a long time ago.[3] This paper can be easily understood without any knowledge of the Hungarian by combining Prof. Max Kaluza's review of it[4] with the English text given in the paper itself. I called attention to a Spanish parallel to Stephano's famous ride on a butt of sack[5] as far back as 1907 and treated later the same question with greater details.[6] In his *Life of Shakespeare*—which I have not at hand—Masefield speaks of a possibility of Shakespeare's being indebted for the plot of the *Tempest* not only to the Fourth Chapter of the *Winter Nights*, but also to other chapters. It almost seems to me that he has borrowed this information from my paper in the *Modern Language Notes* just quoted, although he does not mention it. Dr. Gray duly joins his silence. Neither does he mention that I have shown that the story in the *Mirrour of Knighthood* to which I had paid the chief attention in my 'Probable Source' was performed on the English stage under the name of 'The Knight in the Burning Rock'[7] and that it had been alluded to by Beaumont and Fletcher.[8] Later on I succeeded in showing that another story from the *Mirrour of Knighthood* had been utilized by Massinger for his *A Very Woman*.[9] All references in my 'Probable Source' are to the Clarendon Press edition of the *Tempest*.

Worcester, Mass. JOSEPH DE PEROTT.

A WIELAND QUOTATION BY H. V. KLEIST

In an article entitled *Goethes Amtmann und Kleists Dorfrichter* published in the *Jahrbuch der Kleist Gesellschaft* for 1922, Friedrich Michael enumerates a series of parallels (pp. 75-78) between statements of Kleist and those of Goethe and Schiller. In some instances there is almost literal reproduction on the part of Kleist, in others there is close correspondence of ideas. The author of the article cited above states that systematic attempts at comparison ought to reveal further similar relationships. I wish to point out a paragraph from Wieland which Kleist quoted at the age of fifteen, long before his personal acquaintance with the former.

The passage referred to is taken from Wieland's essay of the

[2] *Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie*, XL, 354, note.
[3] *Magyar Shakespeare-Tár*, IV, 241.
[4] *Zeitschrift für französischen und englischen Unterricht*, XIV, 155.
[5] *Modern Language Notes*, XXII, 77.
[6] *Magyar Shakespeare-Tár*, VII, 310.
[7] *Revue Germanique*, VII, 421.
[8] *Anglia*, XXXIX, 201.
[9] *Germanisch-Romanische Monatsschrift*, II, 5.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

year 1755 entitled *Gesicht von einer Welt unschuldiger Menschen* with the subtitle *Episode aus einem nicht zu Stande gekommenen Werke.*[1] From this writing Kleist quotes the following paragraph as a "Stammbucheintrag,"[2] dated at Potsdam in 1792: "Geschöpfe, die den Werth ihres Daseyns empfinden, die ins Vergangene froh zurücksehen, das Gegenwärtige geniessen und in der Zukunft Himmel über Himmel in unbegrenzter Aussicht entdecken; Menschen, die mit allgemeiner Freundschaft sich lieben, deren Glück durch das Glück ihrer Nebengeschöpfe vervielfacht wird; die in der Vollkommenheit unaufhörlich wachsen — o, wie selig sind sie!"

This passage is quoted by Kleist without naming its author and with but slight variations. In addition to three minor changes in punctuation Kleist writes *Dasein* instead of *Daseyn, zurückblicken* for *zurücksehen,* and places the reflexive pronoun *sich* after the relative pronoun *die* instead of before the verb *lieben.* The passage cited is of real significance since it embodies such ideas as eudemonism and human perfectibility which are outstanding factors in Kleist's early philosophy of life.

Ohio Wesleyan University. JOHN C. BLANKENAGEL.

IS THE SPANISH *Romance* ALWAYS QUATERNARY?

In his edition of *La Estrella de Sevilla* M. Foulché-Delbosc lays down the principle that the *romance* verse is invariably quaternary in its structure, and proceeds to reconstruct the play on this basis. The same principle is applied to *Amar sin saber a quién* in his review of the edition of this play published by Henry Holt and Company. This assumption on the part of M. Foulché-Delbosc seems to have met with approval, as we find a highly commendatory review of this edition of *La Estrella,* and this method of reconstruction in particular, in a recent number of the *Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie.* The reviewer even suggests a slight improvement upon the technique of its application. Before this supposed principle becomes too venerable to be attacked, it would seem wise to inquire what are its foundations, particularly as regards the facts available in the form of autograph manuscripts.

On examining some of the autographs themselves and critical editions of some others, we find the facts to be as follows.

In *El Cuerdo Loco* there are in all four passages composed in *romance* verse, and these are all quaternary. This play is dated 1602. *El Bastardo Mudarra,* dated 1612, shows nine *romance*

[1] *C. M. Wielands sämmtliche Werke.* Leipzig, Göschen, 1857, XXIX, 79.
[2] *H. v. Kleists Werke,* Leipzig und Wien. Bibliographisches Institut, 1904-1905, v, 442.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

passages, two of which are not quaternary. *La Dama Boba,* dated 1613, has seven passages in *romance,* three of which are not in quatrains. *El Brasil Restituido,* the date of which is 1625, contains seven passages in *romance,* only two of which are quaternary. In fact, two passages contain an odd number of lines. *Sin secreto no hay amor* has eleven *romance* sequences, two of which are not quaternary.

The foregoing facts should be sufficient to prove that the *romance* verse, at least as it was used by Lope de Vega, is not necessarily grouped or counted in quatrains, and consequently we cannot accept any suggested emendations based on this assumption only.

McMaster University. B. F. SWEDELIUS.

BRIEF MENTION

Volumes V and VI of *Harvard Studies in Romance Languages* have recently appeared. The former is *La Comédie de mœurs en France au dix-neuvième siècle, tome I, de Picard à Scribe,* by Louis Allard, 1923; the latter, *Eugène Scribe and the French Theatre, 1815-1860,* by N. C. Arvin, 1924. Professor Allard's book is of unusual importance. It finally disposes of the theory, already attacked elsewhere, that the *comédie de mœurs,* like some lost river, plunged underground after Sedaine to emerge only with Augier and Dumas fils. He brings out particularly the importance of Picard as their forerunner. Etienne is also shown to have been of considerable importance. Not only has A. read exhaustively in this somewhat arid period, but he has studied with great care the manners of French society at the beginning of the last century, so that he can speak with authority as to whether or not the subjects of his study are really *comédies de mœurs.* In his introduction he runs through the eighteenth century comedy between 1715 and 1789 and finds genuine studies of manners only in "*l'Ecole des bourgeois* de l'abbé d'Allainville, peut-être dans un acte, *le Cercle* de Poinsinet, dans le répertoire de la Foire, et dans les courtes esquisses que sont les *Proverbes* de Carmontelle." He might have enlarged upon this statement had he utilized an article of Paul Chapponière in *R. H. L.,* XX (1913), 828-844. He brings his study down to 1815, which enables him to indicate all that is characteristic in the plays of Picard. His second volume, which must include a study of Scribe, will be awaited with interest.

There remains need for such a work in spite of Dr. Arvin's publication, for the latter makes a general study of Scribe rather than a special one of his contribution to the comedy of manners. Everybody talks of Scribe, but few have waded through him as patiently as Dr. Arvin. His book will certainly prove helpful to those who would know more of this prolific writer. After a biographical

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

chapter, he treats in succession the *comédies-vaudevilles,* comedies and dramas, *opéras comiques* and operas. A valuable appendix gives a list of Scribe's plays. There is also a bibliographical appendix and an accurate index. It is unfortunate that the author has not used Professor Allard's book, which would have given him suggestions for Scribe's background. Possibly it was not available when he wrote, but the same explanation can hardly be given for the absence of reference to Paul Bonnefon's *Scribe sous la monarchie de Juillet d'après des documents inédits* (*R. H. L.,* XXVIII (1921), 60-99, 241-260), in which he publishes many of the dramatist's letters, accompanied by a biographical sketch that does not always agree with that given by Dr. Arvin.

H. C. L.

The Country Wife and *The Plain-Dealer,* by William Wycherley. Edited by George B. Churchill (Boston, D. C. Heath and Co., 1924). When Macaulay in 1862 thundered against Leigh Hunt's *Dramatists of the Restoration,* he made it clear that the nefarious crew, of whom Wycherley was by all odds the worst, should have no place in the mid-Victorian home. The plays were bad and *ipso facto* the authors were bad, especially Wycherley. The chief witness on the side of the prosecution was, of all persons, Pope, and the offences were that Wycherley lied to give the appearance of precociousness, one of Pope's specialties, and that he married ten days before his death merely to injure his nephew. To Macaulay he was "a lecherous and spiteful old man, dying as shamefully as he had lived." Palmer in his *Comedy of Manners* has restored Wycherley to decency at the expense of Pope and Macaulay and with Ward in the Mermaid edition has given him his proper place both as a man and a dramatist. In fact we are coming to regard Wycherley very much as his reputable contemporaries did. This is made clear in what we may regard as the definitive edition in the Belles Lettres series of *The Country Wife* and *The Plain-Dealer,* which in a brief but very concise biography presents the facts of his life without bias and in the Introduction accords him his place in the development of English dramatic literature. The Introduction is concerned chiefly with establishing as accurately as possible the dates of the plays, about which Pope bore false or untrue testimony, and the relation of the two edited plays to their sources. The facts that Macaulay revealed about the alleged dates are admitted but without the reflections on Wycherley's character that Macaulay cherished. In his discussion of the sources Churchill brings out admirably the difference between the French and the English plays and shows the distinct individuality of the latter whether it be to their credit or their discredit in art and morals. So thorough is this discussion that there is little need of further criticism on the part of the editor. Wycherley is given his

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

place as a drastic critic of his contemporaries, which is his reason for being, and his faults like his lack of humour and his revolting license belong to him as a dramatist of an age that knew not restraint. It is curious that neither in the Introduction nor in the Bibliography is there any mention of Palmer's *Comedy of Manners* (1913).

J. W. T.

The Wisdom of Balzac. By Harry Rickel. New York and London. (G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1923. Pp. xiv, 352.) Did Balzac have in politics and in ethics, in art and in literature certain *opinions arrêtées?* This is the problem which Mr. Rickel would present by making a collection of the novelist's maxims and grouping them under the cover of one volume. The compilation is marred by several faults which detract considerably from its value and interest. The least serious is perhaps the undue amount of space allowed to aphorisms and *pensées* extracted from the novels, while the barest page is given to that most important document, the *Avant-propos* to the *Comédie humaine;* some four pages to the *Lettres à l'étrangère*—why do we persist in rendering this in English by "Letters to a *Stranger?*"—and, finally, less than a dozen pages to the remainder of his vast correspondence and miscellaneous criticisms. Mr. Rickel's grouping of these excerpts has been unfortunate, for he has arranged them by novels, each work separately. It would be a useful thing to have them classified according to subject, so that one might see at a glance what were Balzac's opinions on literature or love, on marriage or Napoleon. Mr. Rickel's index may partially overcome this fault, but more serious still is the fact that he does not discriminate between Balzac's own personal opinions and those which he puts into the mouths of his characters. Vautrin and Gobseck, no doubt, are clever moralists, yet neither may be called a mouthpiece of Balzac. It is interesting to note in this connection that the wife of the novelist made this very objection to Barbey d'Aurevilly's collection of the *Maximes et pensées de H. de Balzac,* the publication of which was halted by her in 1856.

We agree with the author of Mr. Rickel's preface and with Barbey d'Aurevilly, who said the same thing nearly seventy years ago, that Balzac is a thinker of great vigor. Mr. Rickel has unfortunately done little to make us feel this; and Alphonse Pagès' little volume, published in 1866 under the modest title of *Balzac moraliste,* still remains the most convincing proof of this fact.

The chief attraction of the *Wisdom of Balzac* consists in: 1) the reproduction of a Rodin study of Balzac, page 86; 2) the reproduction of a bust of Madame Hanska by Bartolini, page 324—two inconographic souvenirs rarely seen in Balzac libraries.

W. S. H.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

RECENT PUBLICATIONS

ENGLISH

Allen, P. S. and H. M. Sir Thomas More: Selections. *New York:* Oxford University Press, 1924, $1.20.

Andrews, C. E. and Percival, M. O.—Romantic and Victorian Poetry. *Columbus, O.:* R. G. Adams & Co., 1924.

Asquith, Herbert Henry. — Studies and Sketches. *New York:* The George H. Doran Company, 1924. $2.00.

Baldwin, Charles Sears.—Ancient Rhetoric and Poetic interpreted from Representative Works. *New York:* Macmillan Co., 1924.

Botsford, Jay Barrett.—English Society in the Eighteenth Century. *New York:* The Macmillan Co., 1924. $2.50.

Burt, Emma J.—The Seen and Unseen in Browning. *New York:* D. Appleton and Co., 1924.

Camp, Charles W.—The Artisan in Elizabethan Literature. *New York:* Columbia University Press, 1924. $2.00.

Churchill, George B.—'The Country Wife,' and 'The Plain Dealer' by William Wycherley. *Boston:* D. C. Heath & Co., 1924.

Cook, A. S.—The Old English 'Andreas' and Bishop Acca of Hexham [Reprinted from Transactions of the Conn. Acad. of Arts and Sciences.] *New Haven:* Yale Univ. Press, 1924.

Eichler, W.—Wortschatz und Wirtschaft im grossbritannischen Kriegsenglisch. Dissertation, *Greifswald:* 1924. 38 pp.

Fiedler, Anna.—Orthographie und Flexion in Lord Berners' Golden Boke of Marcus Aurelius Emperour and Eloquent Oratour. Dissertation, *Münster:* 1924.

Garrod, H. W.—Byron: A Lecture delivered before the University of Oxford. *New York:* Oxford University Press, 1924. 50 cts.

Gray, Roland Palmer.—Songs and Ballads of the Maine Lumberjacks, with Other Songs from Maine. *Cambridge:* The Harvard University Press, 1924.

Heidrich, Hans.—John Davies of Hereford (1565?-1618) und sein Bild von Shakespeares Umgebung. *Leipzig:* Mayer und Müller, 1924. [*Palaestra*, 143] Gm. 4.50.

Hewlett, Maurice.—Last Essays of Maurice Hewlett. *New York:* Charles Scribner's Sons, 1924. $2.50.

Huxley, Leonard. — Jane Welsh Carlyle. *New York:* Doubleday, Page, and Co., 1924.

Jansson, Alb. J. — Studien zu William Chamberlaynes Pharonnida. Dissertation, *Münster:* 1924.

Jones, Rufus M. — Mysticism in Robert Browning. *New York:* Macmillan & Co., 1924. 50 cts.

Kenyon, John S.—American Pronunciation. A text-book for Students of English. *Ann Arbor:* George Wahr, 1924.

Korten, Hertha. — Chaucers literarische Beziehungen zu Boccaccio. Preisschrift. *Rostock:* Englisches Seminar der Universität, 1924. 64 pp.

MacMechan, Archibald.—Sagas of the Sea. *London:* J. M. Dent & Sons, 1923.

Moore, A. W.—A Vocabulary of the Anglo-Manx Dialect. *New York:* Oxford University Press, 1924. $8.35.

Morton, James.—The Nun's Rule, being the Ancren Riwle modernized. *New York:* Oxford University Press, 1924. $1.85.

Mutschmann, H.—Milton's Eye-Sight and the Chronology of his Works. *Tartu-Dorpat:* 1924.

Neff, Emery.—Carlyle and Mill. *New York:* The Columbia University Press, 1924. $2.85.

Nicolson, Harold.—Byron. *Boston:* The Houghton Mifflin Company, 1924. $4.00.

Pottle, Frederick A.—Shelley and Browning. *Chicago:* The Pembroke Press, 1924.

Raymond, Dora Neill. — The Political Career of Lord Byron. *New York:* Henry Holt and Co., 1924. $3.00.

Robertson, J. M.—The Shakespeare Canon, Part II. *New York:* E. P. Dutton and Company, 1924. $5.00.

Roloff, Hans.—Das Präsens historicum im Mittelenglischen. *Giessen:* Verl. des Engl. Seminars, 1924. 38 pp.

Schudt, Erna.—Das Ausland in Smollett's Romanen. *Giessen:* Engl. Seminar d. Universität, 1923. 35 pp.

Story, E. M.—A Study of "The Ring and The Book." *Oxford:* Blackwell, 1924.

Thompson, Elbert N. S.—Literary Bypaths of the Renaissance. *New Haven:* Yale University Press, 1924.

Trenery, Grace R. — Much Ado About Nothing. (The Arden Shakespeare.) *New York:* Oxford Univ. Press. 1924.

Ullrich, Hermann.—Robinson Crusoe, die Geschichte eines Weltbuches. *Leipzig:* O. R. Reisland, 1924.

Van Dam, B. A. P.—The Text of Shakespeare's Hamlet. *New York:* Oxford Univ. Press, 1924.

Wardale, E. E.—An Old English Grammar. *New York:* E. P. Dutton and Company, 1924. 131 pp. $3.00.

Yeats, William Butler.—Plays in Prose and Verse: Later Poems. *New York:* The Macmillan Company, 1924. $2.50.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

GERMAN

Behaghel, Otto. — Beiträge zur germanischen Sprachwissenschaft. Festschrift für Otto Behaghel. Hrsg. v. W. Horn. [Germ. Bibliothek, II. Abt., 15. Bd.]. *Heidelberg:* Carl Winter, 1924. viii + 340 pp. M. 14.

Berendsohn, Walter A.—Noch ein Stück Knabendichtung Goethes. *Hamburg:* W. Gente, 1924. 22 pp.

Borinski, Karl.—Die Antike in Poetik und Kunsttheorie von Ausgang des klassischen Alterthums bis auf Goethe und W. von Humboldt. 2. Bd. *Leipzig:* Dieterich, 1924. xv + 413 pp. M. 14.

Cysarz, Herbert. — Deutsche Barockdichtung. Renaissance. Barock. Rokoko. *Leipzig:* H. Haessel, 1924. vii + 311 pp. M. 10.

Eilhart von Oberg.—Tristrant. Hrsg. v. Kurt Wagner. 1. Die alten Bruchstücke [Rheinische Beiträge, Bd. 5]. *Bonn:* K. Schroeder, 1924. xii + 48 + 80 pp. M. 5.

Ermatinger, Emil. — Wieland und die Schweiz [Die Schweiz im deutschen Geistesleben, 31. Bdchen.]. *Leipzig:* H. Haessel, 1924. 111 pp., boards, M. 2.

Forstreuter, Kurt. — Die deutsche Icherzählung. Eine Studie zu ihrer Geschichte und Technik [Germanische Studien, H. 33]. *Berlin:* Ebering, 1924. 115 pp. M. 3.60.

Gräf, Hans G. — Goethe. Skizzen zu d. Dichters Leben u. Werken. 2. Aufl. *Leipzig:* H. Haessel, 1924. xii + 488 pp. M. 16.

Heitz, Paul, u. **Fr. Ritter.**—Versuch einer Zusammenstellung der deutschen Volksbücher des 15. u. 16. Jhs. nebst deren späteren Ausgaben u. Literatur. *Strassburg:* J. H. Ed. Heitz, 1924. xvii + 219 pp. Fr. 60.

Jahrbuch der Sammlung Kippenberg. Bd. 3. 1923. Mit 5 Lichtdrucktafeln. *Leipzig:* Insel Verlag [1924]. 320 pp. Bound, M. 5.

Körner, Jos.—Romantiker und Klassiker. Die Brüder Schlegel in ihren Beziehungen zu Schiller u. Goethe. *Berlin:* Askanischer Verlag, 1924. 239 pp. Bound, M. 7.50.

Köster, Alb.—Klopstock und die Schweiz. Hrsg. u. eingel. [Die Schweiz im deutschen Geistesleben, Bd. 22]. *Leipzig:* H. Haessel, 1923. 68 pp. M. 1.40.

Kossmann, E. F.—Die siebenzeilige Strophe in der deutschen Litteratur. *Hague:* M. Nijhoff, 1923. viii + 102 pp. Fl. 3.

Lambert, M. B.—A Dictionary of the Non-English Words of the Pennsylvania-German Dialect. *Allentown:* M. B. Lambert, 1924. xxxi + 193 pp. $4.50.

Liljebäck, Erik N.—Die Loccumer Historienbibel (die sog. Loccumer Erzählungen). Eine mndd. Bibelparaphrase aus der Mitte des 15. Jhdts. untersucht u. hrsg. Diss. *Lund:* Håkon Ohlsson, 1923. xlviii + 259 pp.

Lochner, Rud. — Grimmelshausen. Ein deutscher Mensch im 17. Jh. Versuch einer psychologischen Persönlichkeitsanalyse unter Berücks. literaturgeschichtl. u. kulturgeschichtl. Gesichtspunkte. [Prager deutsche Studien, H. 29.] *Reichenberg i. B.:* Sudetendeutscher Verlag 1924. xii + 208 pp. M. 4.50.

Riess, Gertrud.—Die beiden Fassungen von Goethes "Die Leiden des jungen Werthers." Eine stilpsychologische Untersuchung. *Breslau:* Trewendt & Granier, 1924. 68 pp. M. 1.

Schlegel, Joh. Elias.—Die stumme Schönheit. Ein Lustspiel in einem Aufzuge. Edited by Lawrence M. Price. *New York:* Holt & Co. [1924]. xv + 87 pp.

Thomése, Ika A.—Romantik und Neuromantik mit bes. Berücksichtigung Hugo von Hofmannsthals. *Hague:* M. Nijhoff, 1923. vii + 197 pp. Fl. 4.

Welander, Erik.—Studien zum Bedeutungswandel im Deutschen. Tl. 2. [Uppsala Universitets Årsskrift. 1923. Filosofi, språkvetenskap och historiska vetenskaper. 4.]. *Uppsala:* A. B. Lundequist [1923]. vii + 187 pp. Kr. 6.

Wernher der Gartenaere. — Meier Helmbrecht. Hrsg. v. Friedr. Panzer. 4. Aufl. [Altd. Textbibl. 11.] *Halle:* Niemeyer, 1924. xx + 76 pp. M. 1.80.

Witkowski, Georg.—Textkritik und Editionstechnik neuerer Schriftwerke. Ein methodol. Versuch. *Leipzig:* H. Haessel, 1924. vii + 169 pp. M. 5.—

FRENCH

Baudelaire, Ch.—Les Fleurs du mal avec une étude sur B. par C. Vergruol. *Paris:* Lemerre, 1924. lix + 317 pp. Fr. 10.

Boillot, F. — The Methodical Study of Literature. *Paris:* Presses Universitaires, 1924. viii + 162 pp.

Camerlynck and **Camerlynck.** — France; 2me année de fr. *Boston:* Allyn & Bacon. 1924. 256 pp. $1.25.—Recueil de textes en notation phonétique. *Paris:* Didier, 1924. 64 pp.

Catalogue of books printed in France and of Fr. books printed in other countries from 1470-1600 now in the British Museum. *London:* British Museum, 1924. vii + 491 pp. 21sh.

David, H. C.-E. — Flaubert and George Sand in their Correspondence. *Chicago:* Literary Club, 1924. 31 pp.

Desthieux, F. J.—Taine, son œuvre. *Paris:* Nouv. Rev. critique, 1923. 52 pp.

Desvergiers, Aglaé. — Mémoires de Mlle Aglaé, comédienne, 1777-1830. *Paris:* A. Michel, 1924. 416 pp. Fr. 12.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

Faure, G. — Jean-Jacques Rousseau en Dauphiné. 1768-1770. *Grenoble:* Allier, 1923. 103 pp. Fr. 10.

Fess, G. M.—The Correspondence of Physical and Material Factors with Character in Balzac. Diss. *Philadelphia:* Univ. of Penn., 1924. vi + 108 pp.

France, Anatole. — Alfred de Vigny, éd. revue et corrigée par l'auteur. *Paris:* Impr. Nat., 1923. 221 pp.

——. Representative Stories, ed. by G. N. Henning. *Boston:* Heath, 1924. xlvi + 288 pp.

Goodman, I. S.—French grammar review. *Cleveland:* Univ. Supply Co., 1923. 81 pp.

Green, F. C.—La peinture des moeurs de la bonne société dans le roman français de 1715 à 1761. *Paris:* Presses Universitaires, 1924. 259 pp.

Knowles and Favard. — Perfect French Pronunciation. *Boston:* Heath, 1924. iv + 72 pp. 80 cts.

Labiche et Delacour.—Les petits oiseaux, ed. by James Geddes. *New York:* Scribner, 1924. 175 pp. 88 cts.

La Vaissière, R. de.—Anthologie poétique du XX siècle. *Paris:* Crès, 1923. xl + 227 pp.

Mayoux, H.—Practical course in French. *New York:* Pitman, 1924. 568 pp. $1.75.

Mignon, M.—Etudes sur le théâtre fr. et ital. de la Renaissance. *Paris:* Champion, 1923. vi + 87 pp.

Proal, L.—La Psychologie de Jean-Jacques Rousseau. *Paris:* Alcan, 1923. 467 pp. Fr. 20.

Queste del Saint Graal, la, roman du XIIIe siècle, éd. par A. Pauphilet. *Paris:* Champion, 1923. xiv + 303 pp. Fr. 14.

Ronsard. — Œuvres complètes. Texte de 1578 publ. par H. Vaganay. *Paris:* Garnier, 1924. 4 vols. lxviii + 263, 500, 461, 503 pp.

Roth, G.—La couronne poétique de Byron. *Paris:* Presses fr., (1924). 116 pp. Bibliothèque romantique.

Serban, N. — Pierre Loti. Sa vie, son œuvre. *Paris:* Les Presses Françaises, 1924. xxi, 367 pp.

Seylaz, L. — Edgar Poe et les premiers symbolistes fr. *Lausaune:* La Concorde, 1923.

Tabarin.—Les farces, éd. par H. Frichet. *Paris:* France-Edition, 1924. 192 pp. Fr. 2.50.

Van Roosbroeck, Gustave L., and Constans, Antony.—Polichinelle, Comte de Paonfier, Parodie inédites du Glorieux de Destouches. Suivi des Champs Elysées de Caumont et Destouches. *Paris:* Champion, 1924. 76 pp.

Vermale, F.—Un Poète savoyard. Amélie Gex (1835-1883). *Chambéry:* Dardel, 1923. xxiii + 186 pp.

Williams and Ripman.—A shorter French course. *New York:* Dutton, 1923. $1.

Windham, R.—French Drill Book. *New York:* Fordham, 1923. 76 pp. 60 cts.

ITALIAN

Annali del teatro italiano.—Vol. II (1923). *Milano:* Tip. A. Nicola e C., 1923. 499 pp. L. 40.

Arcari, P.—Manzoni. *Milano:* Edizioni Alpes (Terragni e Calegari), 1923. 201 pp. L. 6.60.

Aretino, Pietro.—Le più belle pagine, scelte da M. Bontempelli. *Milano:* Fratelli Treves, 1923. iii + 305 pp. (Le più belle pagine degli scrittori italiani scelte da scrittori viventi, no. 15.)

Barberino, Andrea Da. — Guerino il Meschino. Romanzo cavalleresco, compendiato pei lettori del secolo XX ed ornato con le figure di Piero Bernardini. *Milano:* Bertieri e Vanzetti, 1923. 268 pp.

Borgese, G. A.—Tempo di edificare. *Milano:* Fratelli Treves, 1923. vii + 270 pp. L. 9.

Cantella, A.—Calderón de la Barca in Italia nel secolo XVII. *Roma:* Casa ed. *Ausonia*, 1923. 113 pp. L. 5.

Caterina da Siena, Santa.—Lettere scelte, col commento di Niccolò Tommaseo, a cura di G. L. *Milano:* Casa ed. Sonzogno, 1923. 336 pp. L. 3.50. (Biblioteca classica economica, no. 139.)

Chagas, F., et Méléar, P.—Virgile, Dante, Camoëns et l'Expansion du génie latin. *Paris:* Champion, 1924. 85 pp. Fr. 5.

De Courten Giartosio, Maria Luisa. — Shelley e l'Italia. *Milano:* Fratelli Treves, 1923. viii + 268 pp. L. 11.

Goldoni, Carlo.—L'avaro. Commedia in un atto. *Bologna-Rocca S. Casciano:* L. Cappelli, 1923. 36 pp. L. 1.

Gori, G.—Il teatro contemporaneo e le sue correnti caratteristiche di pensiero e di vita nelle varie nazioni. *Torino:* Fratelli Bocca, 1924. 283 pp. L. 20. (Letterature moderne. Studî diretti da A. Farinelli.)

Hayward, A. L.—Colloquial Italian. *New York:* E. P. Dutton and Co., 1924. vii + 136 pp. $1.60.

Lazzeri, Z.—La leggenda dei tre compagni. Testo senese inedito del XV secolo. Appendice e discussione critica di —. *Firenze:* G. Giannini e figlio, 1923. ix + 168 pp.

Leopardi, Giacomo.—Pensieri di varia filosofia o di bella letteratura. Vol. V. *Firenze:* F. Le Monnier, 1923. 437 pp. L. 10.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

Manzoni, Alessandro. — I promessi sposi, con note di A. Belloni. *Milano:* F. Vallardi, 1923. 2 vols., xxxvi + 326; 352 pp. L. 15. (Biblioteca di classici italiani annotati.)

Metastasio, Pietro.—Attilio Regolo: dramma in tre atti. *Bologna-Rocca S. Casciano:* L. Cappelli, 1923. 45 pp. L. 1.

Parisi, P.—Roberto Bracco: la sua vita, la sua arte, i suoi critici. *Palermo:* R. Sandron, 1923. 289 pp. L. 8.

Pellico, Silvio. — Le mie prigioni (selections) and Francesca da Rimini. Edited by K. McKenzie. *Chicago, Ill.:* The University of Chicago Press, 1924. 168 pp. $1.40. (The University of Chicago Italian Series.)

Res, A.—Dante. Raccolta di studî a cura di —. Gorizia, MCMXXI. *Gorizia:* G. Paternolli, 1923. ix + 183 pp. L. 24.

Romagnoli, E.—Un anno di vita intellettuale. *Palermo:* R. Sandron, 1923. 292 pp. L. 12. (Biblioteca Sandron di scienze e lettere, no. 82.)

Santini, E.—L'eloquenza italiana dal Concilio tridentino ai nostri giorni: gli oratori sacri. *Palermo:* R. Sandron, 1923. 372 pp. L. 15. (Biblioteca Sandron di scienze e lettere, no. 91.)

Settembrini, Luigi.—Le più belle pagine, scelte da V. Morello. *Milano:* Fratelli Treves, 1924. xxvii + 289 pp. (Le più belle pagine degli scrittori italiani, scelte da scrittori viventi, no. 14.)

Teatro, Il, italiano sperimentale: rassegna annuale. *Bologna:* Edizioni del T. I. S., 1923. 93 pp. L. 5.

Tommaseo, Niccolò, e Capponi, Gino. — Carteggio inedito, dal 1833 al 1874, per cura di I. Del Lungo e P. Prunas. Vol. IV, parte I (Torino, 1854-1859). *Bologna:* N. Zanichelli, 1923. 412 pp. L. 27.50.

Zenatti, A.—Canti popolari trentini, raccolti da —, editi e illustrati da Anna Pasetti. *Lanciano:* G. Carabba, 1923. xxix + 179 pp. L. 10.

SPANISH

Banal, Luisa.—L'ultimo romanzo di Miguel De Cervantes. *Firenze:* F. Le Monnier, 1923. 53 pp. L. 4.

Bretón de los Herreros, M.—La Independencia. Comedia en cuatro actos. Redactada con introducción, anotaciones, vocabulario y ejercicios según el método directo, por J. Geddes. *New York:* Charles Scribner's Sons, 1924. xx + 231 pp.

Carbonell, J. M.—Miguel Teurbe Tolón, poeta y conspirador. *Habana:* Impr. "El Siglo XX," 1924. 43 pp.

Cervantes.—Prologues and Epilogue. *Cambridge:* University Press, 1923. vii + 66 pp. 1 sh. 6 d. (Cambridge Plain Texts.)

Coll y Toste, C. — Leyendas puertorriqueñas. Prólogo de C. N. Carreras. *San Juan:* Editorial Puerto Rico Ilustrado, 1922. 182 pp. (Biblioteca Puerto Rico Ilustrado, IV.)

Espino Gutiérrez, G.—Contribución al estudio de la vida y obras del humanista reverendo padre maestro fray Fernando A. de Zamora. *Salamanca:* Est. tip. de Calatrava, 1921. 170 pp. (Publicaciones de la Facultad de Filosofía y Letras de la Universidad de Salamanca.)

García Fayos, J. — Idiotismos Tulianos. *Madrid:* Impr. G. Hernández y Galo Sáez, 1920. 27 pp.

Keniston, H. — Fuero de Guadalajara (1219). Edited by —. *Princeton, N. J.:* Princeton University Press, 1924. xviii + 55 pp. $1.00. (Elliott Monographs in the Romance Languages and Literatures, 16.)

Laval, R. A.—Paremiología chilena. *Santiago de Chile:* Impr. Universitaria, 1923. 96 pp.

Lemus y Rubio, P.—Prácticas de lengua española. *Murcia:* J. A. Jiménez, 1923. iv + 240 pp.

Marquina, E.—En Flandes se ha puesto el sol. Edited with exercises, notes, and vocabulary, by E. H. Hespelt and P. R. Sanjurjo. With a critical introduction by F. de Onís. *Boston:* D. C. Heath and Co., 1924. xviii + 271 pp. $1.12.

McHale, C. F.—Un viaje a Sud América. A trip to South America. A book of Spanish conversation. *Boston:* D. C. Heath and Co., 1924. x + 284 pp. $1.32.

Morillas, N.—Eduardo de Ory y su labor literaria. Juicios y opiniones de la crítica y de la prensa española e hispanoamericana. *Cádiz:* Tip. Comercial, 1923. 123 pp.

Pinilla Rambaud, A.—El libro español en el Perú. *Lima:* T. Scheuch, 1922. 51 pp.

Rodríguez Salcedo, S.—Formación del talento poético de fray Luis de León. *Palencia:* Afrodisio Aguado, 1920. 64 pp.

Rubió y Lluch, A. — Estudios hispanoamericanos. Colección de artículos publicados desde 1889 a 1922 por —. *Bilbao:* Edit. Eléxpuru Hermanos, 1923. viii + 412 pp.

Sánchez Estevan, I.—Fray Lope Félix de Vega Carpio, semblanza. Obra premiada en el Concurso nacional de literatura de 1922-1923 (Real orden de 31 de marzo 1923). Edición oficial. *Madrid:* Sindicato de publicidad, 1923. 101 pp.

Van Dam, C. F. A.—Las relaciones literarias entre España y Holanda. *Amsterdam:* J. Emmering, 1923. 24 pp. (Conferencia dada en el Ateneo de Madrid.)

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES

VOLUME XXXIX DECEMBER, 1924 NUMBER 8

SHAKESPEARE'S JESTER: THE DATES OF *MUCH ADO* AND *AS YOU LIKE IT*.

It has long been known that Robert Armin, the successor of William Kemp as clown in the Shakespearean company, also made some pretensions to authorship. To his already known work, I wish to add another pamphlet, formerly attributed to John Singer. The title of this piece is "Quips vpon Questions, or a Clownes conceite on occasion offered, bewraying a morallised metamorphoses of changes vpon interrogatories: shewing a litle wit, with a great deale of will: or indeed more desirous to please in it, then to profite by it. Clapt vp by a Clowne of the towne in this last restraint, hauing litle else to doe to make a litle vse of his fickle Muse, and carelesse of carping. By *Clunnyco de Curtanio Snuffe.*

Like as you list, read on and spare not,
Clownes iudge like Clownes, therefore I care not.

Or thus,

Floute me, Ile floute thee: it is my profession,
To iest at a Iester, in his transgression.

Imprinted at London for W. Ferbrand, and are to be sold at the signe of the Crowne ouer against the Mayden head neare Yeldhall, 1600,"[1] 4to, 24 leaves.

[1] Title from Phillipps, *Ill. of Shakespeare*, I, 35, as I have not seen the very rare pamphlet, nor the equally rare reprint by F. Ouvry, 1875. Collier quotes sections *Bib. Acct.*, III, 254-259; and *Hist.* (1879), III, 209-210. The pamphlet should be carefully examined for further biographic detail. Armin's quipping tribute to Tarleton is significant in view of the alleged relation between the two men. Too, the question, "What's a clock?" may have suggested Jaques' report of Touchstone and his watch in *As You Like It*, II, 7, 12-34. Phillipps (*op. cit.*, 35) records reissues in 1601 and 1602, without further description.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

Collier assigned this piece to John Singer.[2] His real reason for the assignment seems to have been that the author is given as Clunnyco de Curtanio, or Clown of the Curtain, where, as Collier thought,[3] the Admiral's men, with whom Singer was clown, were acting when this pamphlet was published in 1600.[4] But we now know that the Admiral's men were at the time acting first at the Rose and then at the Fortune.[5] Thus there is no longer any reason to attribute the work to Singer.

On the other hand, we know that in this very year 1600 Armin was using the pen name with which this pamphlet is signed. In 1608 he published his *Nest of Ninnies*. But this was only a revised re-issue of his *Foole Vpon Foole or Six Sortes of Sottes*,[6] first issued in 1600 as by "Clonnico de Curtanio Snuffe," or Clown of the Curtain, and again in 1605 as by "Clonnico del Mondo Snuffe," or Clown of the Globe.[7] Thus in 1600 Armin was signing himself Clonnico de Curtanio Snuffe. Further, both these pamphlets so signed in 1600 belonged to the same publisher, William Ferbrand.[8] It is apparent then that *Quips* is also to be added to the works of Armin.[9]

The establishment of this fact in turn helps us to a number of fairly important conclusions. Both *Quips* and *Foole* vouch for the fact that Armin's company, probably Chandos' men, was occupying the Curtain. We shall see later that these pamphlets were

[2] Collier, *Bib. Acct.*, III, 254-259.

[3] Collier, *Hist.* (1879), I, 303; III, 86-7 and note.

[4] Collier alleges too a MS. note on the first leaf of his copy, attributing the work to Singer; but such a discovery, especially one made by Collier, need not detain us.

[5] Adams, J. Q. *Playhouses*, 156-7.

[6] Grosart, *Works of Armin*, 2. Probably it should be noted here that the Hamlet allusion in this work appears only in the version of 1608 (*op. cit.*, 58).

[7] Phillipps, *Outlines*, I, 322.

[8] Phillipps, *Cal. of Shakespearean Rarities*, No. 751.

[9] While this paper was being prepared for the press, Chambers' work on the *Elizabethan Stage* appeared, in which he also assigns the pamphlet to Armin (II, 300) solely because of the pen name. The latter part of his story, however, forgets the beginning when he says that Armin was at the time of publication already with the Shakespearean company at the Curtain, since he himself knows that this company was certainly already at the Globe before Sept. 21, 1599 (II, 403, 203, 415).

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

published in the first half of 1600, still further narrowing the date of occupancy. We knew before that some company was acting at the Curtain about March 11, 1600, since on that date there is a notice of the arrest of one William Haukins, "charged with a purse taken at a play at the Curtain."[10] It appears then that in the first half of 1600 Chandos' men were acting at the Curtain and presumably had succeeded the Shakespearean company there when the latter moved to the Globe about the spring or summer 1599.[11] Since Chandos' men were on tour this summer 1599, appearing at Coventry in June,[12] they likely did not open at the Curtain before the autumn of that year. Since Chandos' men were at the Curtain in 1600, it is probable that they were the offenders at the Curtain in May, 1601, and not Derby's as has previously been supposed.[13] "On May 10, 1601, 'the actors at the Curtain' gave serious offense by representing on the stage persons 'of good desert and quality, that are yet alive, under obscure manner, but yet in such sort as all the hearers may take notice both of the matter and the persons that are meant thereby.' The Privy Council ordered the Justices of the Peace to examine into the case and to punish the offenders."[14]

But Armin was not one of these offenders. As we have seen, the second edition of his *Foole Vpon Foole* describes him as clown of the Globe. So early as the *Second Part of Tarleton's Jests* (S. R. Aug. 4, 1600), we hear "at this houre . . . at the Globe on the Bankside, men may see him."[15] Thus it appears that in 1600, at some time before the fourth of August, Armin had transferred from Chandos' men at the Curtain to the Shakespearean company at the Globe.

Since the exact time of Armin's transfer has a bearing on a more important question, it is worth while to narrow our limits as much as possible. We have two pamphlets dated 1600, the *Foole*, and *Quips*, both describing Armin as of the Curtain. Neither of these pamphlets appears on the Stationers' Registers, but inter-

[10] Adams, *op. cit.*, 85.
[11] *Ibid.*, 85.
[12] Murray, *Eng. Dram. Companies*, II, 32.
[13] Adams, *op. cit.*, 87, note 1; Fleay, *Stage*, 161.
[14] Adams, *op. cit.*, 87.
[15] Hazlitt, *Jest Books* (1864), II, 217; Murray, II, 31.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

nal evidence dates *Quips* pretty closely. It was printed by William Ferbrand, whose first book was entered S. R. May 3, 1598,[16] though on Jan. 23, 1598, he had paid a two shilling "fine for printinge a ballad contrary to order,"[17] and was destined to similar trouble March 4, 1601.[18] In view of these latter entries, it should be no cause for surprise that Ferbrand did not register either *Quips* or *Foole*. It appears then that Ferbrand was not in business before 1598,[19] and hence that he would not have acquired either of these pamphlets before that time. *Quips* itself refers to Friday as December 28, which would be 1599, thus further limiting the date.[20]

The title page of *Quips* gives us a still further clue in its statement that the piece was "Clapt vp . . . in this last restraint." Too, the restraint was not of a nature to cause the company to go on tour, since Armin speaks of himself as being idle except for his writing. The only restraint I can find within the limits set was the regular one for Lent 1600 and it would be of the nature indicated. While we do not have a record of the restraining order for this year, we do have for the next;[21] and we know that the Admiral's men turned in no receipts this year of 1600 from February tenth to March ninth.[22] Indeed, this company had regularly observed Lent.[23] Still, as we have seen, the Admiral's returned to work a day or two before March 9, 1600, and Chandos' men before March 11, 1600. If, therefore, the restraint was the regular one for Lent, then Armin wrote *Quips* February-March, 1600, and Ferbrand published it soon after.[24]

[16] Arber, *Transcript S. R.*, v, xci.

[17] Arber, *op. cit.*, II, 828.

[18] Arber, *op. cit.*, II, 832.

[19] Arber's 1588 in his *Transcript*, v, xci is an evident misprint for 1598. See McKerrow, *Dict. of Printers*, 1557-1640, 101.

[20] Chambers, *Eliz. Stage*, II, 300.

[21] *P. C. Acts*, March 11, 1601.

[22] Greg, *Henslowe's Diary*, II, 94.

[23] Greg, *op. cit.*, II, 86, 94.

[24] There may have been a partial restraint later in 1600. The Privy Council ordered June 22, 1600, all playhouses closed except the Globe and Alleyn's new theater, which was to supersede the Curtain, the latter to be torn down (*Malone Soc. Coll.*, I, 81-3). But the Council complained Dec. 31, 1601, that its orders had not been obeyed (*op. cit.*, I, 84), and we have

Thus we may date Armin's transfer to the Shakespearean company as not earlier than March nor later than July 1600. The occasion of Armin's coming to the company at this time seems clearly indicated by Kemp's movements. In his *Nine Daies Wonder* (S. R. April 22, 1600), Kemp informs the ballad makers: "These are by these presents to certify unto your block-headships, that I William Kemp, . . . am shortly, God willing, to set forward, as merrily as I may, whither I myself know not. Wherefore, by the way, I would wish ye to employ not your little wits in certifying to the world that I am gone to Rome, Jerusalem, Venice, or any other place at your idle appoint." Now Mr. Collier has collected evidence [25] which makes it certain that Kemp did go on this journey about this time. Evidently then, Kemp was either departed or shortly to depart by April 22, 1600. His statement "I haue daunst my selfe out of the world" shows that he had previously withdrawn from the Globe project. The coincidence of facts makes it certain that Armin was chosen as Kemp's successor at this time, not earlier than March nor hardly later than April, 1600.

Certainly the company had waited a full year after Kemp's withdrawal from actual acting with them about the spring of 1599.[26]

seen that some company was misbehaving at the Curtain in May, 1601. It is likely then that there was no restraint, even partial, consequent on this order of June 22, 1600. Even so, Chandos' men were traveling this summer, appearing at Coventry July 19 and at Bristol in August (Murray, II, 29, 32), while during the restraint alluded to by *Quips* Armin seems to have been idle.

[25] Collier, *Hist.* (1879), III, 347 ff.

[26] Heminges says Kemp withdrew about the time the Globe was completed (Wallace, *Shak. and his Lond. Associates*, 54). Professor Wallace (Lond. *Times*, May 1, 1914) gives very good grounds for his statement that, "The Globe was begun in January and finished before May 16, 1599." Professor Adams (*op. cit.*, 249) is not certain of May 16 but accepts some time before the end of the summer. It is generally admitted that Jonson refers to the new building in the Induction of *Every Man out of his Humor*, performed 1599. Since Jonson had returned to Henslowe by Aug., 1599 (Greg, *Diary*, II, 289), the play was written before that date. Sordido's almanac (I, 1) shows that the play was put on a considerable time before July 15, probably about sowing time in the spring. Thus the Globe must have been opened about the time Professor Wallace sets. It is significant too that Kemp does not appear among the actors of *Every Man*, confirm-

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

It is probably significant then that Kemp's share in the Globe was at first assigned, presumably in trust, to Heminges, Cundall, and Shakespeare; but was finally divided into equal fourths by these three and Pope.[27] Where Kemp was for this year we do not know, but presumably abroad. It seems likely then that this company had held Kemp's place, important though it was, open for a year; but when he decided on further exploits about March or early April, 1600, found it necessary to choose his successor, Robert Armin.

These facts of succession enable us to date very closely Armin's single surviving play, and two of Shakespeare's. Professor Hillebrand[28] has shown that the allusions in Armin's play, *The Two Maids of Moreclacke,* date June, 1597-February 13, 1602. It is also fairly to be inferred from Armin's words that he acted in this play John of the Hospital originally and would do so again had the play not belonged at publication in 1609 to a company of which he was not a member. Since Armin became a member of the Shakespearean company by August 4, 1600, his play must have been written and acted before that date. Armin's further statement that the play "in part was sometimes acted more naturally in the Citty, if not in the hole" is not quite so clear; but may mean, as Professor Hillebrand thinks, that the first presentation was in the city. If so, the play was not first presented at the Curtain (out of the city), where Armin's company was located from the autumn 1599 till Armin left the company. This would mean that the play dates between June, 1597 and the autumn 1599.[29] Since the company was in the country June, 1599,[30] it is not likely that they performed the play in the city this summer. Since the company was in the country the summer 1597,[30] the play was probably not performed in the city that summer, nor in-

ing the sworn statement of Heminges, given above, to the time of his leaving.

[27] Wallace, *Associates*, 54.

[28] *Jour. Eng. and Ger. Philology,* 21: 328-9; Grosart, *op. cit.*, xvi-xvii had already demonstrated an Elizabethan date for the play.

[29] Capell, *Notes on Shakespeare,* III, 494, says some authorities mention a 1599 edition of *Two Maids,* but neither Grosart nor the Malone Society in its reprint mentions such an edition or even the tradition of it.

[30] Murray, II, 32.

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

deed elsewhere, as is indicated by the contemporary allusion to "Donington's man, Grimes." This supposition is strengthened by the fact that all acting at London was suppressed July 28, 1597, and not again permitted till c. October 11.[31] While we do not have the record of travel for the company in the summer 1598, still the records do indicate that the company regularly traveled in the summer. Probably then the play was performed "in the Citty" either the autumn and winter 1597 or that of 1598, the allusions favoring the former.

The date of Kemp's withdrawal enables us closely to narrow the date of *Much Ado About Nothing.* Since both the quarto and folio inform us that Kemp performed Dogberry, the play must have been produced before Kemp left the company in the spring of 1599. Since, on the other hand, the play is not mentioned by Meres, presumably it was not in existence when his list was compiled shortly before September, 1598. It seems fairly certain then that *Much Ado* was first performed not earlier than the latter half of the summer 1598 nor later than the winter 1598-9.

The date of Armin's entrance in turn enables us to say that Shakespeare wrote *As You Like It* for the summer 1600. The play was entered on the Stationers' Registers August 4, 1600. Halliwell-Phillipps[32] has shown also that Morley's *First Booke of Ayres,* 1600, probably borrows the "lover and his lass," again indicating a date not later than 1600, though I have not been able to locate the accurate date of publication for Morley's book.[33] The fact that *As You Like It* does not appear in Meres's list (before September, 1598) would indicate that it does not date before 1598. The allusion to the "dead Shepherd," Marlowe, would indicate a like dating. Since Marlowe died June 1, 1593, it is certain that this allusion is after that date. But the line quoted is from *Hero and Leander,* entered S. R. March 2, 1598, and published the same year. Of course, it is possible and probable that Shakespeare knew the fragment of the poem in manuscript; but it is difficult to see any point to his allusion unless his audience generally had

[31] Murray, I, 124-5.

[32] Phillipps, *Outlines*, II, 275.

[33] I do not find the book entered S. R. If it does use *As You Like It,* the book could hardly have been printed before the autumn 1600.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

access to the poem and knew it well. Thus a dating of 1598-1600 is strongly indicated for *As You Like It.* Malone then[34] is probably correct in his suggestion that the definite reference to "Diana in the fountain" was suggested by the fountain set up in Cheapside, 1598. The date is further narrowed by "The clownish fool" in motley, Touchstone. Now the fool or jester comes into the company with Robert Armin,[35] who, as we have seen, succeeded Kemp about the spring of 1600. Since Armin did not enter the company before March, 1600, but since Shakespeare wrote a part for him in *As You Like It,* it appears that the play was not written before March, 1600. Thus we conclude that *As You Like It* was written between March and August 4, 1600; hence for the summer season 1600.

As has been noticed, Shakespeare began writing the part of the fool or jester for Armin at the latter's entrance in 1600. Armin's two pamphlets of this year show very clearly why Shakespeare wrote this type of part for him. Armin's *Foole Vpon Foole* is a careful study of the most famous of these naturals or jesters known to Armin. That Armin himself on occasion was accustomed to give a realistic impersonation of these naturals we know on his own statement prefixed to *The Two Maids of Moreclacke,* in which he had included for himself the life of John of the Hospital, one of the fools described in *Foole.* When Shakespeare, then, began constructing fools for Armin in 1600, he was but capitalizing to the full the latter's special training and qualifications. But Shakespeare went further than merely to include a realistic impersonation of some famous fool, as Armin had done in his play. Doubtless Shakespeare saw in Armin what Knight[36] sees in Armin's book, *Quips.* "The book, which is sad rather than comic . . . consists of a series of moral platitudes conveying the idea that the writer was a thoughtful, serious, and kindly man." Join together in one man the qualities displayed in *Foole Vpon Foole* and *Quips,* filter out the realistic impurities through the imagination of Shakespeare, and you have the wise fool Touchstone. Let the resultant mixture mellow for a few years while

[34] Malone, *Var.*, II, 368-9; Fleay, *Shakespeare*, 208.

[35] Fleay, *op. cit.*, 209; in later publication I shall demonstrate this further.

[36] *D. N. B.;* John Singer.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

Shakespeare on closer acquaintance learns the true wisdom that underlies this man's outer folly and you have the foolishly wise Jester of King Lear. We neither have nor need any clearer instance of how Shakespeare capitalized to the full the best that was in each member of his company.[37]

T. W. BALDWIN.

Goucher College.

MR. HARDY'S *DYNASTS* AS TRAGIC DRAMA

Whatever may be the ultimate verdict of posterity, there can be no doubt that *The Dynasts* is one of the most remarkable imaginative works thus far produced in our century. As such, it has been appraised from various angles, and brought into relation with various predecessors, notably Aeschylus[1] and Goethe.[2] Yet not much has been said, so far as I am aware, of its place in the general current of dramatic tradition; and a few remarks on that topic seem worth making, because they lead to some unexpected literary parallels.[3]

The action of *The Dynasts,* it will be recalled, proceeds on four distinct levels. There is, first, the level of various supernatural figures, who throughout view and comment on the events, and even at times intervene to affect them. There is, second, the level of the chief historical figures; and third, the level of the minor participants, some historical, others imagined. There is, fourth, the level of the stage directions, usually condensed but vivid, and sometimes carrying the entire burden of the dramatic effect. To each level corresponds a specific mode of expression. The spirits chiefly employ various lyrical forms; the main historical characters, largely blank verse, but sometimes prose; the minor characters, mostly prose; and the stage directions, of course prose entirely.

[37] I shall demonstrate this adaptation more fully in later publication.

[1] W. L. Courtney, "Mr. Thomas Hardy and Aeschylus," in the *Fortnightly Review,* March and April, 1917.

[2] Barker Fairley, "Notes on the Form of *The Dynasts,*" *Publ. Mod. Lang. Assn.,* xxxiv, pp. 401-415.

[3] The line of thought developed in this paper follows that of my book, *The Supernatural in Tragedy* (Harvard University Press, 1915), joining it at p. 318 of the latter.

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

These levels and their modes of expression intermingle in a fashion which, so far as I can detect, follows no definite principle. Some of the scenes are carried on solely by the directions, as "dumb-show"; some by the historical characters, some by the imagined; some with the aid of choral accompaniment by the spirits, or by their actual intervention. The places shift with no less freedom; we sweep across Europe from Portugal to Moscow, until the grand total of 130 scenes is made up.

Unquestionably the peculiar effect of the work is largely due to the presence of the spiritual participants. They are always at hand to comment on the significance of the action, and thereby to give expression to the philosophy which underlies it—the assumption, namely, that the Universe expresses the activity of an unconscious and purposeless Immanent Will. Towards this conception the different groups of spirits manifest different reactions, sufficiently indicated by their names—*of the Pities, Ironic, Sinister;* while the impassive Spirit of the Years, who serves as a kind of chorus-leader, and who has seen it all before, checks them by opportune reminders of the futility of personal feelings, and even by the revelation of the Will itself, "exhibiting as one organism the anatomy of life and movement in all humanity and vitalized matter included in the display." Yet even this spectacle fails to alter the fixity of their attitudes, and the tone of their respective comments persists unchanged to the end.

This function of comment, however, is not their only one. At times they disguise themselves as mortals to enter the gallery of the House of Commons (I, I. 3),[4] or flit as sea-birds around the ship of the doomed admiral Villeneuve; or again, a spirit of Rumour brings unwelcome news to the crowd in a London ball-room (I, i. 5), or to a street-woman of Paris (I, vi. 7). The device is used more rarely in the second part; and after the Spirit of the Years has delivered a prophecy at the Regent's garden-party (II, vi. 7) it is practically dropped. No doubt conduct which befits the nature of a spirit of Rumour is less appropriate to the antediluvian Spirit of the Years; but the result is the abandonment of an important element of dramatic interest. If it is proper that the spirits should so conduct themselves at all, there seems no good reason why they

[4] In these references the first figure denotes the part, the others act and scene.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

should not continue to do so; and to reduce them to commenters pure and simple sensibly weakens their value—not to mention the fact that their comments are often couched in terms so odd that we are moved to parody one of the utterances of the Spirit of the Pities, and murmur

> But o the intolerable antilogy
> Of making figments sing!

A somewhat similar shift of intention is apparent in the treatment of the human characters. The more important historical characters use, as we have noted, a blank verse that is sometimes vague and sometimes stiff; and even when they lapse into prose, it is a prose much less vivid and savory than that employed by the humbler participants. The travellers on the Wessex ridge (I, i. 1), the cockneys outside the Guildhall at Pitt's triumphal reception (I, v. 5), and above all the two old men who hold their matchless colloquy beside the beacon on Egdon Heath (I, ii. 5), attain a literary effectiveness unmatched elsewhere in the whole work—and quite unconnected with its underlying philosophy. But these scenes, like those of the intervention of the spirits, are practically confined to the first part; there is something of the same flavor in the scenes of the deserters in Spain (II, iii. 1) and that of the burial of Sir John Moore (II, iii. 4), but virtually no more except for a faint afterflash in III, v. 6, the burning of Napoleon in effigy on Durnover Green.

It therefore seems fair to conclude that the main artistic effect of *The Dynasts* is achieved in the first part. The action is there skilfully balanced between the two poles of Trafalgar and Austerlitz, and the figure of Pitt is emphasized as no other of Napoleon's antagonists is emphasized in the sequel. Nowhere again do we find so apt a choral commentary as that which attends Austerlitz, or a lyric with the soul-stirring music of the ballad on Trafalgar. It may of course be argued that the nature of the historical material here lends itself to especially effective treatment; but it may equally be argued on the other side that much of the effectiveness, particularly in the delineation of Pitt, is directly dictated by the material. At all events, though the subsequent parts steadily increase in bulk (302 pages for part II, 355 for part II, as against 228 for part I), there is no equivalent increase in dramatic effective-

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

ness. The taking of Moscow, turning point of Napoleon's career, is despatched briefly; and even the long picture of Waterloo seems to depend for its impressiveness more on the historical interest which it inevitably excites than on the manner in which it is presented.

We may, then, sum up the work as a highly diversified succession of scenes, with a historical foundation but a considerable imagined supplement, and a fairly steady choral accompaniment, and with, in its earlier portion, considerable intervention of supernatural figures in the action. Where, now, shall we look for a parallel to this in previous dramatic literature? Greek tragedy is obviously out of the question. Mr. Abercrombie, in his clever but often perverse book on Hardy,[5] cites Cervantes' *Numantia,* but only with reference to the introduction of spirits, a device which Cervantes was surely not the first to employ. Medieval religious drama seems more in point—yet not English drama, which has no such love for the lengthy scenic sequence. That leaves, as our only resource, the medieval drama of France; and in that drama there does exist a work quaintly like *The Dynasts* in the respects just named—the *Passion* of Arnoul Greban.[6] In it we find a historical basis—the Gospel narratives—with a good many supplementary figures supplied by the dramatist; a portentous number of separate scenes; a set of supernatural participants, here contrasted as celestial and infernal—a variety denied to Mr. Hardy, though his Spirits Ironic and Sinister have certain diabolical affinities, and he permits himself the luxury of Recording Angels. There is also an underlying philosophy—that of orthodox medieval theology, expounded at great length—and a similar lapse of dramatic interest as the work goes on.

Of course I do not pretend to assert that there is here any question of conscious influence; indeed, I should be much surprised to learn that Mr. Hardy had ever even heard of his predecessor. Nor do I suggest that there can be any comparison in the point of artistic merit. Greban drives on for the most port in interminable octosyllabic couplets, varied by excursions into scarcely less formal lyric metres; he has no scenes in prose, and of course nothing like

[5] *Thomas Hardy: A Critical Study,* p. 185.

[6] For a summary account of this see the *Supernatural* aforesaid, pp. 137-144.

Digitized by Google   Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

Mr. Hardy's terse and vivid directions. The latter, however, are really an element apart; and we cannot here enter into the interesting questions of literary theory raised by their use.[7] Yet in its broad lines the parallel stands, especially in the gradual reduction of the supernatural figures to mere commenters, and in the failure to bring out the underlying philosophy in dramatic terms. Even in *The Dynasts* the last revelation of the Immanent Will is of necessity precisely like the first, and no fresh reaction to it is possible either by participants or by readers.

But another parallel remains to be drawn. Take the opening stage direction: "Enter the Ancient Spirit and Chorus of the Years, the Spirit and Chorus of the Pities," and the rest. Where are we to conceive them as entering *from?* Obviously, from nowhere; they are simply present, as soloists and chorus are present at the beginning of an oratorio, their actual entrance on the platform having nothing to do with their artistic function. In fact, it is oratorio, not drama, which would afford the only plausible way of "enstaging" *The Dynasts.* The frequent parenthesis "*aerial music*" which accompanies the choruses is a true signpost; the effects are not dramatic but musical, and as such their influence on the whole tends to be emotional, not structural. Nor is the interchange of pictorial function between choruses and stage directions accidental; we could easily imagine them brought into outward unity by such a device as the "Narrator" of a Bach *Passion.* In other words, the stage directions are not always for any "stage" either actual or conceivable, one of the strongest proofs of this being the casual way in which an important motive is inconspicuously tucked away in one of them. I refer to the phrase describing the entry into Moscow of the French veterans "who have entered every capital in Europe except London" (III, i. 7). Important as it is for Mr. Hardy's general conception, it exists, and can exist, solely for the reader.

So much, then, for the spiritual affiliations with previous drama which *The Dynasts* reveals. They prove, I think, that such affiliations cannot be wholly abandoned even by a writer who would fain cut loose from them. It is amusing to speculate on what the work

[7] I have touched on some of them in my paper "Is Printed Drama Drama?" in the *South Atlantic Quarterly* for July, 1923.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

would have been had it frankly conformed to the English medieval tradition of clear-cut single scenes, giving us, say, a consistent view of the Napoleonic wars as seen through the eyes of Wessex, on the model of the most effective prose scenes which it now contains, and in which, as I hold, its true dramatic vitality resides; but such speculation is perhaps not very profitable. Nor need we here discuss the value of the underlying philosophy, though one may note that the reference, in the preface, to "the prevalence of the Monistic theory of the Universe" is perhaps a little out of date in the century of William James and Bergson. Certainly the outward aspects of *The Dynasts* strikes ones as sufficiently pluralistic! But at all events, the fact that a work which defiantly proclaims itself to have been "shaped with a single view to the modern expression of a modern outlook, and in frank divergence from classical and other dramatic precedent" should reveal unmistakable kinship with such distinctly Christian forms as medieval sacred drama and oratorio is surely not the least of literature's little ironies.

CHARLES E. WHITMORE.

University of Michigan.

SOME SOCIOLOGICAL ASPECTS OF LITERARY CRITICISM

Before it was generally recognized that history is not only an art but also an exact science, the belief prevailed that it is merely a branch of literature. As Professor Shotwell says in *An Introduction to the History of History*,[1] "Clio was a muse," and historians were treated "as masters of style or of the creative imagination, to be ranked alongside poets and dramatists, rather than simply as historians, with an art and science of their own." That this was a narrow conception and took into account only one phase of history, namely its narration, while disregarding its research, to say nothing of its evaluation and interpretation of facts thus acquired, is recognized today. Furthermore it is now agreed that history is "the whole field of the human past"[2] and that "it must be that past viewed historically, which means that the data must

[1] New York, 1922, p. 1.

[2] Shotwell, *op. cit.*, p. 5.

Digitized by Google

Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

be viewed as a part of the process of social development, not as isolated facts. For historical facts are those which form a part of the great stream of interrelation which is Time." Ernst Bernheim[3] has carefully stated the matter as follows: "Die Geschichtswissenschaft ist die Wissenschaft, welche die zeitlich und räumlich bestimmten Tatsachen der Entwicklung der Menschen in ihren (singulären wie typischen und kollektiven) Betätigungen als soziale Wesen im Zusammenhange psycho-physischer Kausalität erforscht und darstellt."

History, then, considers not only individual men and facts, but also human groups, their beliefs, their manners and their mutual relations. And what applies to history from this point of view applies to literary criticism as well. Just as the former was once neglected so far as it is covered by Bernheim's phrase "typische und kollektive Betätigungen der Menschen als soziale Wesen," literary criticism also frequently overstressed individualistic, specifically biographical considerations. In a sense literary criticism even lagged behind historical science in this respect. For the latter was quicker to awaken to the realization of its broader scope and to enlist the aid of other branches of learning as auxiliaries for its purposes. Thus it promptly realized that there is such a science as sociology (still more or less inchoate, to be sure), which it can use as a valuable accessory.[4] Literary criticism however, has been slow to recognize fully the value which the science of sociology has for it, a value which is at the present time well understood in theory but worth emphasizing and demonstrating again in as practicable a way as possible.

Up to recent times it has not often enough been the rule in literary criticism to seek the relations of individual writers to the great social movements of their age. Too frequently the object was to determine the specific personal (in contradistinction to endemic) impressions of a given writer. In other words, the critic's interests usually turned to a study of literary individuality.

[3] *Lehrbuch der historischen Methode und der Geschichtsphilosophie.* (5th and 6th editions, 1914). P. 9.

[4] Cf. Langlois and Seignobos, *Introduction to the Study of History* (transl. by G. G. Berry, London and New York, 1898), p. 320: "History and the social sciences are mutually dependent on each other; they progress in parallel lines by a continual interchange of services."

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

If we examine the methods of the sociologist, we find that he frequently resorts to literature for his evidence.[5] And in the same measure as the sociologist utilizes literature, the literary historian can benefit by sociology. All literary generalizations, for example, are *per se* of a sociological nature, and side by side with dogmatic and impressionistic criticism there exists what may be called "sociological criticism." Again, if we wish to study an individual writer with regard to race, society, environment, influence upon a generation, we must determine first the nature of the collective life which surrounded him and which explains the "influence" of his work. In this case we enter the field of what may be termed "literary sociology."

The comparatively few writings that have appeared, embodying these theories of literary criticism consciously or unconsciously—a good early example is Madame de Staël's *De la littérature considérée dans ses rapports avec les constitutions sociales*, a more recent one G. P. Gooch's *Germany and the French Revolution*,[6] not to mention Kuno Francke's *A History of German Literature as determined by Social Forces*—have been handicapped by the fact that their authors were guided more or less by preconceived theories and often used a method of *a priori* reasoning. A single illustration of this difficulty is furnished by the treatment which Goethe's attitude toward the theme of the unmarried mother has conventionally received. Writers on this topic have usually endeavored to explain Goethe's interest in the subject either from personal experiences of the poet, such as the Sesenheim episode—a futile undertaking[7]—or from individual incidents which Goethe may have read about, an equally futile procedure.[8] To be sure,

[5] Cf. for instance A. Schäffle, *Bau und Leben des socialen Körpers*, II, 376 ff., 2nd ed., Tübingen, 1898; M. H. Cornejo, *Sociologie Générale* (French translation), Chap. 3, p. 250 ff., Paris. 1911; F. H. Giddings, *The Elements of Sociology*, p. 91-2, New York, 1898; W. E. Chancellor, *Educational Sociology*, p. 325 ff., New York, 1919.

[6] London and New York, 1920. My references are mainly to German literature because I am best acquainted with that field.

[7] Cf. A. B. Faust, *On the Origin of the Gretchen Theme in Faust*, Modern Philology, xx, 2 (Nov., 1922), 181-188. Professor Faust gives an adequate summary of the question.

[8] Cf. such an attempt in Otto von Boenigk, *Das Urbild von Goethes Gretchen*, Greifswald, 1914, mentioned in Professor Faust's article.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

critics have not failed to call attention to the fact that the subject of the unmarried mother was one which engaged widespread and deep interest during Goethe's youth, but there they usually stopped. The sociological aspects of the problem and their evident bearing upon it have not been sufficiently brought out by them. Only recently did O. Werner in his Columbia dissertation *The Unmarried Mother in German Literature*[9] take up these aspects in a useful, suggestive way. Clara Stockmeyer has done a similar thing for the entire Storm and Stress period in her work *Soziale Probleme im Drama des Sturmes und Dranges*[10] and Friedrich List in his pamphlet *Der junge Goethe als Sozialerzieher*[11] has considered the youthful Goethe from this point of view. But these cases are isolated instances—a surprising fact because few countries have had a greater number of conscious social and sociological thinkers among their literary men than precisely Germany. Richard Fester in a work that touches on this subject[12] mentions the sociological doctrines of a large number of German writers—Herder, Kant, Schiller, Fichte, Schelling, Friedrich Schlegel, Schopenhauer, Herbart, Krause, Hegel and Wilhelm von Humboldt. And the Argentine writer Ernesto Quesada, in his pamphlet on doctrines of sociology prior to the constitution of sociology as a science,[13] discusses Herder, Kant and Hegel in this connection in his copious notes.

It is of course a mistaken belief that when one studies a given writer one is dealing merely with an individual. The individual author creates his work not for himself but for a collectivity or group that we call the public. Consideration for this public influences in some measure the composition of most literary products and determines in part their character. This fact has often been predicated especially for French literature, whose *sociabilité* and *civilité* form one of Ferdinand Brunetière's favorite theses both in his *Histoire de la Littérature Française Classique* and in his *Études Critiques sur l'Histoire de la Littérature Française*.[14] But it holds

[9] New York, 1917.

[10] Frankfurt, 1922.

[11] Giessen, 1922.

[12] *Rousseau und die deutsche Geschichtsphilosophie*, Stuttgart, 1890.

[13] *Las doctrinas presociológicas*, Buenos Aires, 1905.

[14] Cf. especially the essay in the fifth series of the *Études critiques* (10th

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

true for other national literatures as well. All art presupposes a public and the very nature of literature implies a collective reader or listener besides an author.[15]

What has thus far been said applies in a measure to all the genres of literature. With reference to some of the prose types this applicability in readily apparent. Thus historical and expository writing, with its necessary relation to and dependence upon sociological facts, usually bears its sociological imprint on its very face. The same is true of imaginative prose if (as in the novels of Scott or Willibald Alexis) it deals with historical or (as in the novels of Spielhagen) with social subject matter, while if it has a purely individualistic or esthetic character (as in the novels of Paul Heyse), the very lack of sociological contacts often throws a valuable sidelight upon its author. In the case of philosophical prose the sociological aspect is not so patent. Yet even here social psychology would teach us that such writers as Kant and Nietzsche would have been impossible phenomena at any other periods and under any other sociological conditions than those into which they were born. Dramatic literature both of the stage and closet type always has a marked sociological stamp, sometimes from the point of view of subject (Goethe's dramas of the French Revolution), sometimes with regard to treatment (Hofmannsthal's Greek adaptations), often with regard to both (Ibsen and Hauptmann). The implications of Levin Schücking,[16] which show quite conclusively to what a remarkable extent the Elizabethan dramatist was influenced by his audience from the point of view of form as well as content, could readily be applied in at least a measure to any other period of literary history. Thus the interesting argument to which Calvin Thomas, in his *Goethe* in the chapter on "The Dramatist,"[17] is led by the application of the theory of *mores* brings him

ed., Paris, 1896) entitled *Sur le caractère essentiel de la littérature française* (pp. 251-276).

[15] Cf. Levin L. Schücking, *Character Problems in Shakespeare's Plays*. New York, 1922 (translation of *Die Charakterprobleme bei Shakespeare*, Leipzig, 1919), pp. 8-9; 113; 158-160; 193-4; 202; and especially 14-26 and 235, for an exposition of the importance of the Elizabethan dramatist's, and especially Shakespeare's, regard for his audience.

[16] Cf. preceding footnote.

[17] *Goethe*. By Calvin Thomas. New York, 1917, p. 259 ff.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

to much the same conclusion for the Goethean drama as Schücking has independently reached for the Elizabethan drama.

Poetry shows its sociological stamp just as decisively, if not as clearly. Epic poetry has for many centuries, from the days when the study of Homer was introduced into the ancient Greek schools, been regarded as offering a "picture of its time." Again, a comparison of the style, manner and attitude of, say Goethe in his epic fragment *Achilleis* (1799) and of Carl Spitteler in his epic *Olympischer Frühling* (1910) shows, among other important differences, the vast sociological gap separating the two eras in question. No less essential is sociology for the criticism of the ballad and the idyl, however much they may owe their form to fixed traditions and however much they may reveal the impress of some individual poet. Special claims have been made with regard to the purely individualistic, in contrast to social or collective nature of lyric poetry. To the extent that lyric poetry is usually subjective, they are justified. Yet lyric poets do not as a rule sing for themselves alone. The minnesinger addresses his liege lady, the meistersinger his judges, the religious lyrist his co-believers and the modern poet his circle of readers. Rarely does a lyrist immediately transform into verse the feeling that prompted him to write; he takes time to seek adequate expression for his feeling. Nor is the most frequent subject of the lyric—love—an individualistic one. No love lyric, and in fact no lyric at all, can be truly successful unless it strikes a sympathetic chord in its audience. Otherwise it remains a piece of mere virtuosity.

Two general types of literary problems may be distinguished. One is retrospective in its method and may be called the question of sources; the other looks forward and embraces the problem of influences. The former involves the process of linking the individuality of the writer with the collectivity or sum total of social elements, that is, all the traditions, be they historical, racial, ethnic, political or esthetic, which have cast their reflex upon him. The second type, the problem of influences, may be said to involve the study of the career of a work, the examination of how it becomes collective property, revealing a certain community of sentiments between its author and the readers of succeeding generations, and crystallizing collective thought.

There are, moreover, certain principles underlying and govern-

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

ing literary history which sociology serves to emphasize and make clearer. One of them is the principle of the correlation of life and literature. Similarly sociology can be applied to the principle of foreign infiltrations in literature and to the question of literary influence in general. It can also serve to elucidate the doctrine of the succession of esthetic and literary forms and the principle of the undulatory progression of literary history.

In short, literary critics must increasingly bring the sociological point of view to bear upon conventional standards of criticism, which have been guided more by various other considerations such as individualism, impressionism, biography, chronology and philosophy. While each of these aspects has its justification and usefulness, sociology, which helps to supply an analysis of the elements that constitute literary history, will deserve an important place in future critical endeavors.[18]

Edwin H. Zeydel.

Indiana University.

ON. *NORNIR* 'FATES'

In the *Vǫluspá,* 8, we read that the gods (*æsir*) were once upon a time enjoying a wonderful golden age "until three giant maidens, very powerful ones, came from Jötunheim": *unz þríar kómu þursa meyar, ámátkar mjǫk, ór Jǫtunheimum.*

This seems to mean that the golden age would have lasted longer, would have lasted forever, if it had not been for the coming of the norns or fates. The intervention of these powerful ones is fateful even for the gods, for very soon their troubles begin.

That the *þursa meyar . . . ór Jǫtunheimum* refer to the norns is generally assumed, and I see no good reason for doubting the correctness of the identification. If they are not the norns, then we are entirely at sea and the passage seems quite hopeless.

In *Vafþrúðnismál,* 49, there is another passage which has also been understood to refer to the norns, though the identification is somewhat less obvious. Like the norns in *Fáfnismál,* 12, the

[18] Later I hope to deal separately with the new critical school headed by Sauer and Nadler, which lays great emphasis upon the social point of view.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

hamingjur assist mothers in childbirth. Like the *þursa meyar* of *Vǫluspá* these *hamingjur* are of the race of the giants.

In skaldic mythology Loki is the son of the giant Farbauti, and his wife is Angrboða, a giantess. Their daughter Hel is thus an almost pure-bred giantess. The home of the giants is in the north.

The significance of all this is that beings associated in some way with death are conceived of as related to the giants in the north. The two principal realms of death, Hel and Jötunheim, are localized in the north. It is especially Jötunheim which is of interest in connection with the problem of the origin of the word *norn*. It is said to lie in the north, or in the east,—which probably, at any rate for the most part, means in the direction of the White Sea. The norns are so frequently the representatives of death that there is really nothing very strange about their localization in the northern Jötunheim. They never could have come out of the sunny south.

Another illustration may be given. The Icelander Thidrandi was aroused one moonlit night by a noise outside, and with sword in hand he went out to investigate: " (hann) heyrði, at riðit var norðan á völlinn. Hann sá, at þat váru konur níu, ok allar í svörtum klæðum, ok höfðu brugðin sverð í höndum. Hann heyrði ok at riðit var sunnan á völlinn, þar váru ok níu konur, allar í ljósum klæðum ok á hvítum hestum." The rest of the episode may very easily be guessed. Thidrandi was attacked by the black-robed fylgjur and slain.[1] These fylgjur are the representatives of death, and quite naturally they come from the north.

I shall not look for the origin of the word *norn* in the vast depths of primitive Indo-European speech. Its isolation in West Scandinavian does not speak in favor of very great antiquity for the word, but rather against it. It does not occur in East Scandinavian or in East or West Germanic. Nor shall I try to force the meaning 'spinner' upon it, though doubtless the norns must have spun many a thread of fate.

The word *norn*, declined like an *i*-stem in the plural, *nornir*, does not look like an old Germanic *i*-stem, for it has the vowel *o* in the radical syllable, in noticeable contrast to *urðr*, pl. *urðir*, A-S.

[1] *Fjörutíu Íslendinga-þættir*, Reykjavik, 1904, p. 341; for the white-robed figures cf. E. H. Meyer, *Germanische Mythologie*, 1903, p. 266.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

wyrd, OS. *wurd.* But this consideration does not help us along very much.

In the *Vǫluspá,* as we have seen, the *þursa meyar,* the norns, come from Jötunheim. To borrow a phrase from Snorri, used in another connection, they come *norðan ór Jǫtunheimi,* from the north out of Jötunheim. Is it not possible, after all, that *norn* contains the familiar word *norðr, norð-,* 'north'?

The standard ON. word for 'northern' is *norrønn,* with long *ø,* from **norðrōnjaR.* The history of the suffix is obscure, but it seems likely enough that it is related by ablaut to Goth. (*uz-*)-*anan,* 'breathe,' hence 'blow.' If this is so, then *norrønn, suðrønn, austrønn, vestrønn* are old wind-adjectives which in the course of time (but very long ago) have become generalized. The origin and meaning of the suffix is, however, of no great importance for our present problem. It is clear that this word for 'northern' cannot have been the source of *norn,* for the vowel of the suffix in *norrønn* was not syncopated until centuries after *norn* first appeared in the record. If *norn* contains the word *norð(r),* then the suffix must have been a different one. Incidentally we may note that the syncopated form of *norrønn* turns up very late as *norn* < *norrøna,* f., the Norse dialect of the Shetland and Orkney Islands. ON. *norrøna* also means 'a breeze from the north.'

ON. *norrønn* does not have the only suffix which might have been combined with *norð(r).* Another possible suffix is *-īna-, -īnō,* a widely used suffix of origin and material,[2] which may be translated 'from the place' or 'out of the material' expressed by the word to which it is suffixed. This is the suffix in ON. *Heinir,* 'people of Heiðmǫrk,' a district in Norway, from **Heiðnir,* which again is a reduction of an original **HaiðīnīR;* cf. Ptolemy's *Χαιδεινοί,* which shows that the name is an old one.[3]

ON. *nornir* is probably a substantivized adjective like *Heinir,* the only difference between them being one of gender; cf. *gestir,* m., *urðir,* f. Its immediate phonetic predecessor must have been **norð(r)nir,* 'beings from the north.' Exactly when this (poetic) word for *urðir,* 'fates,' was formed can hardly be established, but

[2] See Kluge, *Stammbildungslehre,* §§ 57, 198-200.

[3] For other examples of the suffix *-īna-* in names of peoples see Much, 'Völkernamen,' in Hoops, *Reallexikon,* Vol. IV, p. 429.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

there is surely no good reason for supposing it to be as old as **HaiðīniR* > *Heinir*. A **norðīniR*, 'fates,' probably never existed. For the syncope compare *gullnir*, pl. of *gullinn* (Goth. *gulþeinai*, pl. of *gulþeins*).[4] For the loss of the interconsonantal ð in **norð-nir* compare *ornir* beside *orðnir*, plural of *orðinn*, pp. of *verða*, 'become.'[5]

Thus the vowel *o*, which would be out of place in an old Germanic *i*-stem, finds a natural explanation. It is the same as in *norðr*, *norðan*, *norrønn*, etc. *Nornir* < **norðnir* indicates the existence of an adjective **norðinn* from **norðīnaR*, the *o* being borrowed from the *a*-umlauted form.

In dealing with the etymology of nouns generally we are in the habit of starting out from the singular form. This habit must be broken in the case of the word *norn*. Here we must begin with the plural, for syncope of the suffix-vowel would not have occurred in the nominative singular. It is now clear that the singular *norn* is merely a back-formation from the plural; that it has been inferred from the syncopated forms *nornir*, *norna*, etc. In a case like this it is hardly correct to say that *nornir* is the plural of *norn*; it is better to say that *norn* is the singular of *nornir*. Similarly ON. *nafn*, 'name,' is the singular of the plural *nǫfn*; cf. Goth. *namō*, pl. *namna*.[6]

An ON. adjective **norð(r)inn* (or **nyrðinn*) has not survived, but nevertheless I have ventured to assume as a matter of course that the suffix *-īna-* has been used in combination with a word for direction. That such a combination is not un-Germanic may be seen form OHG. *sundarîn*, 'southern.' In the *Monsee-Wiener Fragmente*, Regina Austri surget (*Matthew*, 12, 42) is rendered *Cunincgin sundan arrîsit*, but in *Tatian* it is *Sundarînu cuningin arstentit*, "the Queen of the south shall arise."[7] In OHG. *sundar* + *în* we have precisely the kind of combination which I have assumed to lie back of ON. **norðnir* > *nornir*, the fates who came from the north.

Franklin and Marshall College. S. N. Hagen.

[4] See Noreen, *Gesch. d. nord. Sprachen*, § 50, c.

[5] Noreen, *Altisl. u. altnorw. Grammatik*, § 245, 3; *Gesch. d. nord. Sprachen*, § 85.

[6] For other examples see Noreen, *Gesch. d. nord. Sprachen*, § 195, 8.

[7] Braune, *Althochd. Lesebuch*, p. 21.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

A NOTE ON *RAOUL DE CAMBRAI*

In their critical edition of *Raoul de Cambrai*[1] Meyer and Longnon establish a sharp distinction between the two parts of the poem as it is preserved to us:[2] "La chanson de Raoul de Cambrai se divise, à première vue, en deux parties très distinctes par le fond et par la forme. Jusqu'à la tirade CCXLIX inclusivement le poème est rimé, à partir de la tirade CCL il est en assonances. . . . C'est la partie rimée qui est la plus ancienne [being a *remaniement* of a previous assonanced version]. Le reste est une continuation sensiblement plus récente" [p. iii]. In composing this second part of the poem "un auteur inconnu s'est avisé de souder à l'ancien poème mis en rimes une continuation qui n'a plus rien du caractère en même temps historique qu'héroique de l'œuvre primitive" [p. iv]. Hitherto practically all who have discussed the poem have adopted the division established by Meyer and Longnon; even Acher[3] and Bédier[4] who have effectively assailed the editors' affirmation of the historical foundation of the poem have unquestioningly accepted the statement that *laisse* 249 is the last of Part I and that Parts I and II have nothing in common. And yet, curiously enough, an examination of *laisse* 249 must needs convince us either that it is not the last laisse of Part I but the first of Part II: i. e., that it does not belong to the "original poem" but must form part of the alleged continuation, or else that *laisse* 249 contains a direct anticipatory reference to the episode with which Part II begins and that consequently Parts I and II must be more or less intimately connected. I proceed to demonstrate.

The situation at the end of Part I is this:

After the death of Raoul at the hands of Bernier the kinsfolk of Raoul

[1] Paris, 1882 [S. A. T. F.].

[2] The poem is preserved in one manuscript, Bibl. Nat., no. 2493, fonds fr. [cf. Meyer and Longnon, pp. lxxvi-ix]. Fauchet made an extract of about two hundred and fifty verses [Bibl. Nat. 24,726, fonds fr.; cf. Meyer and Longnon, pp. xcii-xciv]; and a Belgian fragment has been found and edited by A. Bayot [*Rev. des bibl. et arch. de Belgique*, 1906, 11 ff.] Both of these versions are almost certainly derived from our manuscript.

[3] Cf. *Rev. d. l. rom.*, L (1907), 237-66; ibid., LIII (1910), 101-60; *Z. R. P.*, XXXIV (1910), 88-90.

[4] Cf. *Rev. hist.*, XCV (1907), 225-62; ibid., XCVII (1908), 1-26; *Lég. Ep.*, II, App.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

[his mother, Alice, his uncle, Guerri, his nephew, Gautier] had vowed revenge upon Bernier and the Vermandois [Bernier is the illegitimate son of Ybert, one of the four sons of Herbert de Vermandois]. After intermittent warfare both parties are summoned to Paris where the king, Louis d'Outremer, is holding his court. An impending conflict between the Cambrésis and the Vermandois is converted into a lasting reconciliation through the good offices of the Abbot of St. Germain. The allies now combine against the king, who had been the prime mover of the discord that had led to the death of Raoul;[6] they set the torch to the king's fair city of Paris.

Now in *laisse* 246 the allies proceed to St. Quentin after the burning of Paris. In *laisse* 247:

> A St. Quentin vinrent en Vermandois.
> "Sire G[autier]," dist Bernier li cortois,
> "G[uerri] mes sires s'en ira en Artois
> Et vos irez a Cambrai demanois," etc. 5504-7.
>
> A ces paroles sont departi manois.
> Li sors G[uerris] s'en ala en Artois,
> Dame A[alais] en Cambrisis ses drois. 5519-21.

In *laisse* 248 Guerri proceeds "droit a Arras" and Gautier to Cambrai. Let us now quote *in extenso laisse* 249 which according to Meyer and Longnon represents the last of Part I:

> Gautiers, G[uerris], B[erneçons] li cortois,
> A S. Quentin vinrent en Vermandois.
> La segornerent grant partie del mois,
> Car de lor plaies erent encor destrois.
> Avec oux ont .ij. bons mires cortois.
> Qant gari sont, si s'entornent manois;
> Li sors G[uerris] s'en ala en Artois;
> O lui enmaine B[erneçon] li cortois.
> Dame A[alais] en Cambrisis ces drois.
> La est alée; Gautier enmaine o soi.

An examination of this *laisse* reveals several significant facts: I. Meyer and Longnon apparently satisfied themselves that it belongs to Part I because it is in rhyme while the next *laisse* [250] is

[6] On the death of Raoul's father Louis had assigned his fief of Cambrai to Gibouin de Mans. When Raoul on attaining his majority demanded the restoration of his father's possessions the king had refused, but had mollified him by promising him the first fief that would fall vacant. The first fief was that of Herbert de Vermandois; Raoul attempted to wrest Herbert's estates from the hands of his successors, and in the course of the fighting that followed was slain by Bernier.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

in assonance, but as a matter of fact the mere matter of rhyme is no criterion here. Meyer and Longnon themselves have noted [6] that *laisses* 268 and 340 of the second part are very exactly rhymed; and *laisses* 269 and 302 are likewise. *Laisse* 269 is in "ois," which is precisely the rhyme that we find in *laisse* 249. Consequently on the basis of rhyme alone it is altogether likely that *laisse* 249 is the first *laisse* of Part II and that by coincidence it is one of the few *laisses* of the assonanced part of the poem that are in rhyme.—II. Certain statements made in *laisse* 249 are contradictory to statements in the foregoing *laisses*. Thus *laisses* 246, 247 and 248 lead us to believe that after a council of war held at St. Quentin the allies immediately [7] separated, Guerri leaving for Arras, Gautier and Alice for Cambrai while Bernier remained in St. Quentin. But in *laisse* 249 all remain in St. Quentin "grant partie del mois" with two skillful "mires" attending to their wounds, and when they finally leave Guerri takes Bernier with him to Arras.—III. The fact that Guerri does so constitutes an undeniable reference to the first few *laisses* of Part II. If Guerri takes Bernier as his companion to Arras it is for a definite purpose: Beatrix, the daughter of Guerri, is to see Bernier, is to fall in love with him and the bonds of union between Guerri and his erstwhile foe are to be strengthened. Indeed no sooner is Bernier in Arras, in *laisse* 250, when Beatrix in fact does become enamored of him and the resulting love-episode overshadows everything else for eight *laisses* [250-7].

If we sum up the foregoing we find that two possibilities present themselves: I. *Laisse 249 may be the first laisse of Part II.* We have seen that the mere fact that it is in rhyme is no reason for its inclusion in Part I. If *laisse* 249 is the first of Part II the contradictions between *laisse* 249 and the preceding would be explained on the basis that the poet of Part II was quoting from memory and consequently had a more or less vague recollection of the "données" of the last two or three *laisses* of the first part of the poem. The allusion to Bernier's voyage to Arras in the company of Guerri would simply be a stereotyped anticipatory reference.—II. *Laisse 249 may be the last laisse of Part I.* In that

[6] *Op. cit.*, p. lxxiii.

[7] "Demanois," 5507; "manois," 5519.

Digitized by Google   Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

event the contradictions between *laisses* 249 and the following may be ascribed to the carelessness of the *remanieur,* a carelessness that finds its counterpart elsewhere in Part I. But in that event the anticipatory reference to *laisse* 250—the trip of Bernier to Arras in the company of Guerri—is to be explained on the basis that Parts I and II are not absolutely distinct but have a more or less fundamental relationship.

A significant fact seems to indicate that the second of these two probabilities is the more likely. It is evident that *laisse* 249 is more or less closely connected with *laisse* 247 because three lines are identical while two lines in 249 are reminiscent of two in 247:

Identical Lines

	Laisse 247	Laisse 249
A St. Quentin vinrent en Vermandois..........	5504	5547
Li sors G. s'en ala en Artois..................	5520	5552
Dame A. en Cambrisis ces drois...............	5521	5554

Parallel Lines

Laisse 247	Laisse 249
Je suis encore de mes plaies destrois 5508	*Car de lor plaies erent encor destrois* 5549
A ces paroles *sont departi manois.* 5519	Qant gari sont, si *s'entornent manois.*

If we consider *laisse* 249 as the first of Part II the evident relationship between *laisses* 247 and 249 precludes at the very outset any possibility that the contradictions between *laisses* 249 and the foregoing may be due to the fact that the continuator was quoting from memory and that the facts must have been rather hazy in his mind. If *laisse* 249 is to be considered as belonging to Part II we must conclude that the author of Part II had access to the manuscript of Part I and that he filched three lines in order to give a greater appearance of genuineness to his continuation. This view can hardly be accepted. If the continuator had the manuscript of the poem before him he would not have made so palpable a blunder;[6] nor would there be any need of his deliberately distorting the facts simply in order to bring Bernier to Arras. As Bernier and Gautier had become definitely reconciled, Bernier might

[6] Throughout Part II there is evidence that the poet is thoroughly familiar with Part I; there is not a single instance of a statement of fact contradictory to any made in Part I.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

have betaken himself thither at any time either before or after his convalescence. If the continuator were subtle enough to plagiarize so ingeniously would he not have perceived that any such startling discrepancy in statement as we have noted would have caused his reader at once to doubt the authenticity of his version?

On the other hand if *laisse* 249 were the last of Part I we must imagine that the *remanieur* has been guilty of a decided slip in having his *dramatis personae* remain in St. Quentin for a month in laisse 249 though they had presumably separated immediately after their conference with Bernier in the preceding *laisses*. As a matter of fact such complacent contradictions are a commonplace of Part I;[9] one could cite numerous examples of which the following are typical:

1. In *laisse* 160 Guerri bids Pierre d'Artois accost the Vermandois and inform them that the truce between the two armies is to be annulled; Pierre performs his mission. Yet, Bernier in *laisse* 161 appears to accuse Guerri of treachery in attacking without warning:

> "Respit et trives nos aviés demandée,
> Et con traïtres le nos as trespassée." 3289-90.

2. When Aliaume lies dying after his disastrous duel with Guerri he turns to Bernier:

> "B[ernier], biau sire, por amor Dieu m'aidiés."[10] 4711.

to which Bernier replies:

> "Je ne puis, sire, moult en sui esmaiés." 4713.

Gautier, however, with whom Bernier had previously fought, announces his readiness to aid Aliaume [4714] and in line 4715

> Il li aide comme vasals proisiés.

Thus only Gautier, apparently, is hearing the dying man's confession. But line 4718 represents Aliaume as confessing himself

> As .ij. barons q'il vit aparilliés.

3. In spite of the fact that the poet has previously described with great detail the efforts of the king to effect a reconciliation between Bernier and the kinsfolk of Raoul, no sooner has the reconciliation taken place when

> Li rois s'en torne, plains fu de maltalent,
> Car dolans fu de cel acordement. 5363-4.[11]

---

[9] It is undoubtedly the *remanieur* to whom this defect of composition is to be ascribed: cf. Meyer and Longnon, p. lvii; G. Paris, *Journ. des sav.*, 1887, p. 617; Acher, *Rev. des lang. rom.* L, p. 239.

[10] It is of course as an impromptu confessor that his services are required. Cf. J. D. M. Ford, "To Bite the Dust and Symbolical Lay Communion," *PMLA*. xx (1905), 197 ff.

[11] For other instances of contradiction in Part I cf. 1593-1600; 2170-8; 3020-5; *laisses* 152-3.

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

The contradictions between *laisse* 249 and the preceding, then, are no more serious than various others in the first part of the poem and are to be ascribed to the carelessness of a *remanieur* who is indifferent to the fact that his bungling often involves alteration or even mutilation of the subject matter: "Le remanieur n'est pas seulement un piètre poète; c'est encore un esprit qui ne se distingue pas précisément par la clarté." [12]

In view of the foregoing it is probable that *laisse* 249 does indeed belong to Part I; and in that event the allusion to Bernier's voyage to Arras in the company of Guerri, which, as we have seen, constitutes a direct reference to *laisses* 250-7, involves the supposition that Parts I and II are intimately connected. It is my intention in a subsequent paper to show that not only is such the case but that Parts I and II—I follow herein a suggestion of Tavernier [13]—originally constituted one poem.[14]

LAWRENCE M. LEVIN.

University of South Dakota.

THE FIRST FRENCH SONNETS

In a recent article on *The First French Sonneteer*,[1] Mr. N. H. Clement presents an interesting analysis of the sonnets of Clément Marot and of Mellin de Saint-Gelais, and demonstrates clearly that on the basis of all the available evidence Marot, not Saint-Gelais, introduced the sonnet into France. Much of the important literature of the question, however, seems to have been inaccessible to Mr. Clement, and several minor changes should consequently be made in his conclusions.

[12] Acher, *Rev. d. l. rom.*, L, 239.

[13] In *ZFSL.* XLVI (1923), 119, T. intended to develop this idea, but his death prevented his doing so. Professor Behrens writes me that no treatment of the subject has been found among his papers.

[14] The fact that Part I is in rhyme while Part II is in assonance is very readily to be explained on the basis that the entire poem was originally in assonance and that a *remanieur* began to revamp the entire poem in rhyme and completed only 249 laisses. This theory was suggested by G. Paris in his extensive review of the Meyer and Longnon critical edition [*Journ. des sav.*, 1887, p. 628].

[1] *Romanic Review*, XIV, 189-198 (April-September, 1923. Issued March, 1924).

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

The basis for most of the modifications which I am about to suggest will be found in Pierre Villey's admirable study *Marot et le premier sonnet français,*[2] which first definitely established Marot's primacy in the field. M. Villey, however, did not mention the fact that Saint-Gelais had a sonnet printed in 1546;[3] and as this fact is the only one which cannot be established by a simple reference, it will be well to discuss it at the outset.

The sonnet in question is that which opens with the words:—

Ne craignez point, plume bien fortunée . . .

Mr. Clement points out in a footnote (p. 195) that this poem . . . "is explained by Saint-Gelays in these words: *Mis au davant d'un petit traité que je fis intitulé: Advertissement sur les jugemens d'astrologie à une studieuse damoiselle."* He then adds, "Blanchemain claimed that he had a copy of this pamphlet with this sonnet on the frontispiece and that it was published at Lyons in 1546." But he evidently doubts Blanchemain's "claim," and expressly declares in his summary that "not until 1547 did Saint Gelays publish any [sonnets]." And curiously enough Brunet, *Supplément* II, 558, lists the *Advertissement* as of 1556, apparently contradicting Blanchemain's very full bibliographical description. The *Supplément,* however, is here unquestionably in error; for there is in the Sorbonne library [R440(3)] a facsimile reprint of the *Aduertissement sur les Iugemens d'Astrologie, Lyon, Iean de Tourne, M D X L V I,* with the sonnet on the verso of the first leaf.[4] In spite of the *Supplément* to Brunet, therefore, the pamphlet was evidently published in 1546; and Saint-Gelais, accordingly, had a sonnet printed in that year.

[2] *Revue d'Histoire littéraire de la France,* XXVII (1920), 538-547.

[3] Cf. *ibid.,* p. 545, note 2.

[4] The reprint forms pages 276-319 of *Le Trésor des pieces angoumoisines inédites ou rares,* Angoulême, F. Goumard, 1866. For this description I am indebted to the courtesy of Professor H. Carrington Lancaster, who was able to examine the work in the Sorbonne library.

It may be added that the only copy of the original edition I have been able to trace is catalogued in the Ste. Geneviève library, also at Paris. Miss Elsa Vieh of Radcliffe College and Sèvres, who kindly undertook to look up the work, found that the volume itself is unhappily now missing from the library, but the various *fiches* all give the date as 1546, confirming the evidence of the reprint.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

Mr. Clement's article ends thus:—"To resume my argument: The first sonnet published in France was Marot's in 1545; not until 1547 did Saint Gelays publish any. The first regular sonnet was composed by Marot in 1528-1531; not until 1547 did Saint Gelays adopt it, though he seems to have been experimenting with a like form in the period between 1531 and 1547. The first French sonnet that can be dated was written by Marot in 1528-1531; no sonnet of Saint Gelays can be dated before 1536."

Making the necessary modifications, we should read: The first sonnet published in France was Marot's in 1539;[5] not until 1546[6] did Saint-Gelais publish any. The first regular French type sonnet that we know of written in France was composed by Marot in 1536[7] . . . The first French sonnet which can be dated was written by Marot in June-July, 1536;[7] no sonnet of Saint-Gelais can be dated before 1538-1542.[8]

One other matter that calls for comment is the repetition at several points in the article of the idea, still widely current, that Italian sonnets could not in the sestet be divided into a quatrain and a couplet. The schemes *ccdede* and *ccdeed,* which become the normal types in France, were, it is true, extremely rare in Italy; but, though uncommon, they were not unorthodox;[9] and the other quatrain + couplet forms (those preferred by Saint-Gelais) were used by a number of Italian poets. And as very few instances of

[5] *La suite de l'adolescence Clementine* (*Imprime a lyon par Iehan Barbou. M.D.XXXIX.*), f. 252 *recto,* "Pour le May . . ." etc. Cf. Hugues Vaganay, *Le Sonnet en Italie et en France au XVIe Siècle,* Lyon, 1903, 39. 7.

[6] See above, third paragraph.

[7] Villey. *l. c.*, p. 542. M. Villey may be said to have proved conclusively that the sonnet "Pour le May . . ." etc. was written in 1538, the Seigneur Trivulse in question being Pomponio (not Teodoro) Trivulzio.

[8] Villey, *l. c.*, p. 546.

[9] For a brief analysis of the theories held on this point in Italy down through the first half of the sixteenth century, see *Publications of the Modern Language Association of America,* XXXVIII, 743-744. I may add that in tabulating some time ago the rhyme schemes of 4392 Italian sonnets of the first half of the *Cinquecento,* I noted twenty-four different sestet types; including *cdcdcc, cddcdd, cdcdee, cddcee, ccdede,* and *ccddee.* And while the Italians considered even types like *cdcdee* or *ccdede* as consisting of two tercets, to a non-Italian they obviously divided into quatrain + couplet.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

such use have hitherto been pointed out, it may be interesting to cite in conclusion, from readily accessible editions, a hundred or so sonnets, by a dozen different Italian poets of the fourteenth century, whose sestets, to any but an Italian, admit of no other division than into a quatrain followed by a couplet. The common type *cddcdd* is here omitted, because while readily falling into quatrain + couplet it divides equally naturally as two tercets *cdd cdd*.

For sonnets with sestet rhyme-scheme *cdcdee*, see:—

(a) *Liriche di Fazio degli Uberti per cura di Rodolfo Renier*, Firenze, Sansoni, 1883 (pp. 139 ff., 156, 158, 159, 239, 240, 245, and cccxvii, ll. 7-9)
—by Fazio degli Uberti, Antonio da Ferrara, Luchino Visconti, and Anon., - - - - - - - 12

(b) *Rime di Trecentisti Minori, a cura di Guglielmo Volpi*, Firenze, Sansoni, 1907 (pp. 108-109, 187)
—by Antonio Pucci and Simone Serdini, - - - 2

(c) *Sonetti burleschi e realistici dei primi due secoli, a cura di Aldo Francesco Massera*, Bari, Laterza, 1920 (vol. I, pp. 197 ff., 244, 247; vol. II, pp. 3, 4, 18, 19, 20, 23, 63)
—by Niccolò del Rosso, Marino Ceccoli, Cecco Nuccoli, Neri Moscoli, Ridolfo and Pietro di Maestro Angelo, Cucco di Messer Gualfreduccio Baglione, and Anon., - 81
[Among the sonnets of Marino Ceccoli are also three in *cdcdcc;* in vol. I, pp. 240, 243, 245.]

(d) Eugenia Levi, *Lirica Italiana Antica*, Firenze, Bemporad, 1908 (p. 157)
—By Niccolò de' Rossi, - - - - - - 1

In the works cited above, sonnets with the sestet rhyme-scheme *cddcee* occur:—

in (a), pp. 139 ff., 244, and cccxvii, ll. 7-9; by Fazio degli Uberti and Anon., - - - - - - - 9
in (c), vol. II, p. 10; by Cecco Nuccoli, - - - - 1
in (d), p. 240; by Pucciarello da Fiorenza, - - - 1

Consequently, in addition to modifying some of Mr. Clement's dates, we must once more note as erroneous the common belief that Italian sonnet sestets could not be divided into a quatrain and a couplet.

WALTER L. BULLOCK.

Bryn Mawr College.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

NOTES ON VOLTAIRE

1. *Voltaire's Correspondence with M. De Brus.*

The history of Voltaire's efforts, in the name of tolerance, in behalf of the unfortunate family Calas is well known. Not only did he give aid and encouragement, but he also interested others of prominence, who played an important part in the defense of the unhappy widow and her children. Among these were four leading citizens of Geneva, who formed a sort of secret committee.[1] To these gentlemen Voltaire wrote a long series of letters, the majority of which have been printed in Coquerel's *Lettres inédites sur la Tolérance*,[2] and in the Moland edition of Voltaire's *Oeuvres*. The library of Lyons has a manuscript which contains a letter from Voltaire to De Brus, which does not occur in these collections. It is as follows:

> A Monsieur De Brus à Genève. L'affaire des Calas, Monsieur, traine bien en longueur; il paraît qu'il est plus aisé de rouer les gens que de rendre justice à l'innocence. Je vous prie de m'envoyer l'adresse de Madame Calas, et de vouloir bien dire à l'un des deux frères qui sont à Genève de passer chez moi quand leurs affaires le permettront. J'ai quelque chose à leur remettre. J'ai l'honneur d'être, Monsieur, votre très humble et ob. str.
>
> Voltaire. Ferney, 28 fév.[3]

Although the letter bears only the date "28 fév." it is listed in the *Catalogue des Manuscrits* as follows: "Voltaire à M. de Brus, 28 fév. 1764.", which seems to be the correct date. From this letter it would appear that it had been a long time since Voltaire had communicated with his friend, whereas, in late February and early March 1763, Voltaire wrote several letters to him. On February 28, 1765, Pierre Calas was no longer at Geneva.[4]

2. *Possible Variants of Oedipe.*

Voltaire's tragedy, *Oedipe,* given for the first time on November 18, 1718, was not printed until the following year. The Moland

[1] DeBrus, Moltou, Vegobre, and Cathala. Cf. Coquerel, p. 38.

[2] Paris. 1863.

[3] *MS.* 1724, f. 428. My thanks are due to M. Magnien, Asst. Librarian of Lyons, who put this manuscript at my disposal.

[4] Cf. Coquerel, p. 46.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

edition [5] gives a large number of variants which occur in the different editions, and it is clearly apparent that Voltaire found many changes necessary in his play.

If the evidence contained in a brochure of 1719, *Le Journal Satirique Intercepté,* one of the many contemporary polemics occasioned by *Oedipe,* is reliable, Voltaire made several alterations in the period between the first performances and the printed edition. This brochure contains the following lines which are unlike the corresponding lines of the printed play:

I. *Des climats* fortunés, où commence le jour.[6]

II. *Un héros, dont le bras* au défaut du tonnère
Des monstres, des tyrans savait purger la terre.[7]

III. J'ai fait des souverains, *j'ai dédaigné de* l'être.[8]

IV. The final scene is abridged, according to the pamphlet. Instead of the two final speeches of Jocaste, we find the following condensation:

Et moi, je me punis,
Et veux dans les horreurs du destin qui m'opprime
Faire rougir les dieux qui m'ont forcée au crime.[9]

However, it should be noted that in the case of I and II the same lines are given twice in *Le Journal Satirique Intercepté* with the following differences: I. *De ces lieux* fortunés où commence le jour,[10] and II. as in the edition of 1719.[11] This may signify that Voltaire's admirer had heard the lines incorrectly, or that Voltaire made certain changes in the wording of the same lines during the first run of the tragedy.

3. *Voltaire's Correspondence with Bollioud Mermet.*

Voltaire's election to the Académie Française on May 9, 1746, was followed by invitations from other Academies, among them the Académie des Sciences, Belles Lettres et Arts de Lyon.[12] In the

[5] Voltaire, *Oeuvres*, II, 112-117.

[6] *Jour. Sat. Int.* Paris, 1719, p. 27.

[7] *Idem*, p. 24. [Reminiscence of *Phèdre*, 1045, 1046.—H. C. L.]

[8] *Idem*, p. 17.

[9] *Idem*, p. 20.

[10] *Idem*, p. 17.

[11] *Idem*, p. 18.

[12] The following are some of the academies of which Voltaire was a

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

Correspondance of Voltaire there is a letter of July 12, 1746,[13] addressed to M. Bollioud Mermet, the secretary of this Academy, which refers to a book by the latter, sent to Voltaire a short time before,[14] but the letter which accompanied this book and to which Voltaire is obviously replying is not included in the *Correspondance*. The *Revue Rétrospective* [15] has a copy of Voltaire's letter of July 12, 1746, and also of the letter by Bollioud Mermet,[16] both included in a group of letters pertaining to Voltaire. No statement in reference to the source of these two letters is made, except for the meaningless footnote: "Communiqué par M. Jules Goschler." Bollioud Mermet's letter was omitted from the 1880 edition of Voltaire's *Oeuvres* either because the editor had not seen it in the obscure and inaccessible publication of 1838, or because the stamp of authenticity was lacking in that no source was quoted. Now, in a manuscript belonging to the Académie de Lyon, *Correspondance Académique,* there is a copy of these two letters,[17] one of them a "lettre écrite à M. de Voltaire le 28 juin, 1746, par M. Bollioud Mermet. On a lu à l'Académie ce projet de lettre et sa réponse par M. de Voltaire, qui est ci après le 20 juillet, 1746." This letter illuminates Voltaire's answer, which is a good example of his manner of dealing with those who sought his favors, and casts additional light on his relations with the Académie de Lyon. It runs as follows:

L'honneur que les académies de Lyon se sont procuré, Monsieur, en vous admettant au nombre de leurs membres, n'a pas été l'unique objet de leur choix. L'utilité que votre association promet à nos citoyens qui cultivent les sciences et les beaux-arts a suffi pour déterminer leur empressement. Il ne nous importe pas moins de consulter dans nos ouvrages la délicatesse de votre goût, que d'admirer dans les vôtres ce que nous ne présumons pas d'imiter. M. Pallu, dont j'éprouve les bontés dans toutes les occasions, et qui ne cesse de signaler son zèle pour l'avancement des lettres dans cette ville, m'a persuadé que si je n'avais pas l'avantage d'être personnelle-

---

member: Lyons, Saint Petersburg, Bologna, London, Marseilles, Edinburgh, Dijon, La Rochelle, Bordeaux, "della Crusca."

[13] *Correspondance* (Moland), Years 1741-1749, p. 462.

[14] *De la Corruption du Goût dans la Musique française*, 1746.

[15] Paris, 1838, 3me Série, III, 375.

[16] The *Revue Rétrospective* has "M. Bolliond."

[17] *Correspondance Académique*, Folio 231.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

ment connu de vous, Monsieur, le titre de votre confrère pouvait suppléer à ce défaut et m'autoriser à vous demander quelques moments et quelques coups d'oeil pour un de mes essais académiques. Souffrez donc que j'interrompe vos occupations pour vous offrir cette ébauche comme un hommage dû à la supériorité de vos talents. J'espère que vous ne ferez pas à nos académies le tort de juger de leurs productions par cet ouvrage, mais que vous me rendrez assez de justice pour juger par les sentiments qu'elles ont à votre égard, de ceux avec lesquels j'ai l'honneur d'être. . . .[18]

George B. Watts.

University of Minnesota.

REVIEWS

The Evolution of Arthurian Romance, by James Douglas Bruce, Professor of the English Language and Literature in the University of Tennessee, 2 vols.: *Hesperia, Ergänzungsreihe,* Nos. VIII and IX, Göttingen and Baltimore, 1923.

The 'Olympian grasp' of his subject, a term often so aptly applied to Gibbon's *Decline and Fall,* may well be applied also to the late James Douglas Bruce's *Evolution of Arthurian Romance.* It includes much more than the history of the growth of the Arthur cycle down to the year 1300, which takes up nearly two-thirds—or about five hundred and forty pages—of the work. After that follow discussions of various disputed Arthurian matters (such as the date of the Battle of Badon Hill), analyses of French *lais* and of all accessible French, Portuguese and Spanish, Italian, German, and Dutch Arthurian metrical romances down to 1300, and bibliographies of critical literature on the Arthurian theme. There are also copious notes throughout and a careful index. The book is impressive in its scholarly comprehensiveness.

When Professor Bruce died suddenly in February, 1923, he had been engaged in his huge undertaking for about twelve years. Of the two volumes of this last and crowning achievement of his career, he had the first ready for publication, with the proof corrected and the preface written. Of the second, as Professor Bright

[18] I am indebted to M. Roux, Secretary of the Académie de Lyon, who kindly put this and other manuscripts at my disposal.

Digitized by Google

Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

says in his prefatory note, the proof had not been corrected, nor had the Index of Subject Matter and the Index of Critics been extended to include references to the second volume. In Dr. Bright's own phrase, the 'considerable task of seeing the second volume through the press has been almost entirely performed by Dr. Morris Edmund Speare. He has exercised the required technical skill, and especially shown an admirable devotion to the memory of a true scholar.'

The purpose of Professor Bruce's work, as has been intimated, is not merely to give the story of the growth of Arthurian romance. It is also, according to his preface, to serve as 'a guide through the mazes of . . . modern critical writings' that have to do with his theme. Professor Bruce decided to carry his study only to the year 1300, because to cover the whole mediaeval period would have meant an 'indefinite postponement of its completion.' Needless to say, the period he has treated is by far the most important in Arthurian history. After the popular beginnings of the great legend, its literary development came in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. However much we should have liked to read Professor Bruce's discussions of works of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, as *Sir Gawain and the Green Knight* and Malory's *Morte Darthur,* after all such works have comparatively little bearing on the evolution of the Round Table cycle. That, so far as its main stories were concerned, had virtually attained its final form a century and a quarter after Geoffrey of Monmouth established it in literary dignity.

In regard to the first aim of Professor Bruce's work—to trace the growth of the great Arthurian legend—not all students will agree entirely with his theories. He states in his preface his opinion that, as concerns the origin of the cycle, the debt to Celtic sources 'has been, generally speaking, greatly exaggerated and that personal invention was the most important factor in the creation of these romances' (Preface). His presentation of the matter, accordingly, will emphasize that point of view, though it is of course his desire—and, with only an occasional unimportant exception, he succeeds in it—to be fair to scholars who hold different views. Similarly regarding the whole question of folk-tale sources of the romances, he says that the writers 'were primarily poets, not transcribers of folk-tales, and it seems strange that scholars

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

should so often have imputed to them the strictest accuracy in following' their sources (Preface). Whatever modicum of popular Celtic material did get incorporated in the romances, Professor Bruce believes came to French poets from Brittany, and not from Wales in either Anglo-Saxon or Anglo-Norman days. As to Irish sources, 'the debt of the French romances' to them seems also 'to have been greatly exaggerated' (I, 94).

Obviously there is room for difference of opinion as to the justice of these conclusions, for the evolution of the Round Table cycle will probably always be a debatable subject. Professor Bruce's acceptance of Excalibur as 'certainly identical with the sword *Caladbolg* of the Irish prose epic *Tain bo Cualnge*' (I, 87), and parallels between English and French romances and Irish popular story in regard to loathly ladies and the 'beheading game,' make possible a greater debt to Ireland than he implies. The immediate model for the list of Arthurian knights in Chrétien's *Erec* (l. 1526), he says, may have been 'such a list, for example, as that in the Welsh tale, *Kulhwch and Olwen*' (I, 253). If possible Welsh indebtedness may be admitted here—and it seems to this critic that the two lists are very different, one covering only a few lines and the other several pages—why not frequently elsewhere? Again, Professor Bruce, though concluding that Robert de Boron was a native of Picardy, believes him to have 'sojourned for some time in England' (II, 115). This might be taken as an argument in favor of the theory of an Anglo-Norman diffusion of Arthurian story. Study of the whole matter of course is never likely to be free from conjecture. Professor Bruce, in discussing the Grail legend, speaks happily of the 'ritual theory' of its origin as being 'a mere deluge of hypotheses' (I, 287). Even to-day, after so many scholars have devoted so much time to studying the growth of Arthurian romance, while eminently rational discussions, like Professor Bruce's, are far from being *deluged* by hypotheses, to some extent they must make use of them. In order to see how far apart lack of definite evidence may lead sane scholars in discussing the same subject, it is interesting to compare Professor Bruce's opinion of the inventiveness of Chrétien de Troyes—'the plan and the main idea of each romance are his own' (I, 112)—with a recent opinion of Professor R. S. Loomis—'Crestien de Troyes has ceased to be, for those who have examined without prejudice the

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

accumulated evidence, more than a charming *remanieur.* His *Ivain, Erec, Lancelot,* and *Percival* are simply refined but very close relations of earlier French *Contes* of ultimate Breton origin.'[1]

But while some difference of opinion is naturally to be expected, with the mass of Professor Bruce's conclusions reasonable scholars will agree. For his last work, like his earlier ones, is conspicuous for its sane, sound judgment. It may appear in any footnote, as in his doubt of Spenser's indebtedness to the Old French *Perlesvaus* (Branch VII, IV-VI) for his episode of Lady Briana's 'lewd' and 'shameful' custom of exacting a toll of ladies' locks and knights' beards for the lining of her knight's mantle (*Faerie Queene,* Book VI, Canto I) from those who pass her castle.[2] Though Professor Bruce does not say so, it is necessary to seek no source here for Spenser but Malory's *Morte Darthur,* with which he was well acquainted, and it is significant that Malory's Arthur, in refusing Ryons's request for his beard for Ryons's mantle, characterises that king's message as the 'lewdest' and 'most shamefulest message that ever I heard speak of' (*Morte Darthur,* Book I, Ch. XXVI). Other examples of sane judgment in both notes and text might be given indefinitely; it is sufficient to refer to two. Discussing the possibility that the Irish saga, *Serglige Conculaind* (*Cuchulinn's Sick Bed*), in some variant form, may have been the source of Chrétien's *Yvain,* Professor Bruce concludes, after giving summaries of the two stories:—'Most readers, we believe, will agree with us, that it would be impossible for the French poet to extract from such a story the plot of *Yvain,* as we have recounted it above. Except that in each the lover runs mad, on losing his mistress, the two stories have virtually nothing in common (I, 99).' And in regard to Tristram, finding no trace in early tradition of the story of that hero's childhood and parentage, Professor Bruce conjectures plausibly that it was invented by 'the author of the lost primitive French *Tristan.* In the *chansons de geste,* nearly all the great heroes had *enfances,* including occasionally some romantic narrative concerning their parents, so that when the legend of Tristan passed into the hands of a poet familiar with

[1] "Bleheris and the Tristram Story," *Modern Language Notes,* XXXIX, No. 6, June, 1924, p. 239.

[2] II, 14, note 26.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

French epical tradition, Tristan, too, was provided with a set of youthful adventures' (I, 188).

There is also a wealth of good literary criticism in the book, of which again it is enough to cite only a few examples. In the way of generalisation, Professor Bruce says, 'in most Celtic stories, from the early Irish sagas down to the tales which J. F. Campbell collected in the nineteenth century in the Western Highlands of Scotland, the main impression left on the reader is one of diffuseness and incoherence' (I, 47). And how true that of the average romance 'want of concentration . . . is the bane' (I, 417). There is likewise discriminating criticism of special works, as of the *Estoire del Saint Graal* in the great *Vulgate Cycle,* which is called 'one of the most remarkable outbursts of the mediaeval imagination,' and of which it is said that the author, who did not restrict himself to Christian or oriental legend, and whose purpose was only to interest his readers, 'felt himself at liberty in his romance to compound with the deepest theological and mystical conceptions of his time stories of piracy, of *voyages imaginaires,* and even, perhaps, of farce.' The author so 'dulls the effect of his finer conceptions . . . by . . . minor incidents that are both insignificant and extravagant' that, as a result, 'we have the usual formlessness of Arthurian romance in a heightened degree, owing to the length of the work. Few other productions even of the Middle Ages illustrate so well the truth of the Greek proverb, that "the half is better than the whole"' (I, 391, 392). But when a work deserves praise, Professor Bruce accords it in full measure, as in speaking of the *Mort Artu* of the *Vulgate Cycle,* which as a work of art ranks high above most mediaeval romance.

Sound judgment appears again in the arrangement of the material, which is in the main presented chronologically. First comes a statement of the early traditions concerning Arthur. Then there is consideration of the lays, and after that of the romances, with theories about the origin of both. Then follow studies of Chrétien de Troyes and other romancers and naturally of the main stories told in the metrical romances—those of Merlin, Tristram, Lancelot, and the Holy Grail. After the metrical the prose romances are discussed. The relations of the various works receive detailed study, space especially being given to the Grail stories and the vexed question of their origins, as is fitting because of the

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

complicated nature of the theme. Particularly interesting is Professor Bruce's study of the so-called 'Didot-Perceval,' that Alfred Nutt and others have taken for an indirect rendering in prose of the third member of Robert de Boron's trilogy. Professor Bruce not only shows good reason for thinking that such cannot be the case, but he believes it probable that the sequel to Robert de Boron's *Joseph* and *Merlin* was never written at all (I, 421).

Finally, quite aside from Professor Bruce's profound study of the growth of the Arthurian cycle, with his accompanying critical remarks, it is impossible to speak too highly of his work as a book of reference for students of his subject. His analyses of lays and romances make it possible to become acquainted easily with a vast amount of narrative material that is often very hard reading, because of its great diffuseness, and that has at times been difficult—sometimes exceedingly so—to have access to. His bibliographies and his notes leave the impression that nothing of importance in the field of Arthurian investigation, so far as he considers it, has escaped his notice. A noble monument to scholarship, Professor Bruce's work is one which students of Arthurian romance will find invaluable.

G. H. Maynadier.

Harvard University.

Spanische Literaturgeschichte. Von Ludwig Pfandl. Erster Band. Leipzig: Teubner, 1923. Pp. vi, 122.

Many years have passed since a history of Spanish literature has come out of Germany; especial interest, therefore, is aroused by the first instalment of Dr. Pfandl's history, which closes with the reign of Charles V. Since there is ample room for such a scholarly compendium, it is to be regretted that the author was not able to print his complete account at one and the same time. A critical survey of a torso cannot do justice either to the structure of the book as a whole or to the balance and the relation of the parts to one another. However, the reader entertains the assurance that the remaining part or parts will be as understandingly written as the first. Dr. Pfandl shows devotion to his task and a sound appreciation of the material with which he deals; and, although one differs with him here and there, these differences may represent

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

two points of view which arise from dissimilar backgrounds, experiences, and personalities. Inasmuch as this is a thoughtful book, I shall discuss the ideas more frequently than its concrete material. Of Dr. Pfandl's equipment, erudition, and extensive reading there can be no doubt, and he has presented his subject with simplicity and clearness.

The book begins with an introduction explaining the genius or spirit of the Spanish people, the chief traits of which are described as idealism and realism. One hesitates to accept this mechanical pigeonholing of all manifestations in a history of esthetic ideas. As regards Spain this classification is not new; it may be found occasionally in critics since the days of the Romantic movement; various writers on *Don Quixote* have repeated it. It is unsatisfactory because it cannot explain many literary works without putting the greatest strain and flexibility on the words 'ideal' and 'real,' nor without granting exceptions at every turn. For example, many writers have seen in *Don Quixote* the expression of an exceedingly lofty idealism mingled with the realism, and yet the author claims (page 5) that realism "celebrates its greatest triumphs in *Don Quixote,* the *comedia,* the *Buscón* and Guzmán de Alfarache." To mention *Don Quixote* with the picaresque novel is certainly unhappy; and if the *comedia* is realistic, exception must immediately be taken to most of Calderón, to Vélez de Guevara, and a great deal of Lope and Tirso. The rest of the introduction lays the foundation for the four epochs into which Dr. Pfandl divides Spanish literature up to the date of Charles V. The development during the Middle Ages is well explained and for pedagogical reasons the assertion may be acceptable that "sich 500 Jahre lang eine zuerst französische, dann orientalische, dann provenzalisch-galizische und schliesslich italienisch-germanische Strömung der Reihe nach ablösen." These four currents give the author the keynote to his four periods.

The first period, which deals with the supremacy of French influences, is circumscribed by the years 1050-1250; there is a brief introductory résumé, followed by a concise presentation of the earlier epics (Heldenlieder, 1050-1200) and of the Mester de clerecía (Geistliche Dichtungen und gelehrte Kunstepik, 1200-1250). The author has skilfully compressed a wealth of material into eleven pages, but leaves the student with the desire of a more

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

extended treatment, notably where the characterization of the *Mio Cid* overemphasizes the "typically French details" (page 12), and does not find space for those many purely peninsular traits which make the *Mio Cid* on the whole a very different creation from the *Roland.* In the matter of dates assigned to movements, influences, and literary forms, a qualifying statement is needed to show that these do not succeed one another (sich ablösen): they overlap, permitting the old and the new to exist at the same time, and often for many years, before the later manifestation reigns alone. Thus, the transition from the Mester de juglaría to the clerecía is not readily placed at 1200, for it covers a wide range of years, and the creation of learned narrative poems also extended considerably beyond 1250. This stricture, with more or less flexibility, applies to the dates given to distinct periods; such figures are debatable, unless the need of precise dates for teaching purposes be insisted upon. Dr. Pfandl has followed the custom of giving to most of his divisions the dates of corresponding monarchs; but these almost never coincide strictly with periods of literary history, and possess only the advantage of every mechanical subdivision. On page 16 mention might be made of the probably wholly Latin sources of Berceo's *Milagros,* which follow a Latin manuscript at Copenhagen, according to R. Becker, Inaug.-dissert., Strassburg, 1910.

The second period deals with the spread of Oriental and Occidental forms of narrative and the cultivation of Galician lyric poetry (1250-1400). Oriental influence is one of the most illusive known to history; it is difficult to trace and cannot easily be enclosed in dates. It lived in oral narrative for centuries; it was already developed in the days of Petrus Alfonsus, as Dr. Pfandl admits, and traces of Oriental culture are apparent in the folklore of the popular tales of the Spanish peninsula. Arabic chronicles must have been known and preserved before the days of Alfonso X, who used them for his prose compilations. The character of Western culture and the sources of Spanish prose narrative are well treated in the first sections (pp. 19 ff.); notably the origin of the Romance of Chivalry is succinctly presented. Any analysis of Gallego-Castilian lyric poetry and its subsequent influence on fifteenth-century lyrics (Höfische Poesie) is always difficult; Dr. Pfandl's brief statements would gain in arrangement if they were

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

treated in their entirety under one heading (pp. 21 and 31). The sections on Alfonso X and his time and the didactic literature contain some excellent pages, notably those dealing with Juan Manuel, Juan Ruiz, and López de Ayala.

The third period (1400 to 1474) deals with the transition of Galician to Castilian poetry and the first manifestations of the influence exerted by Italian humanism. We become acquainted with some of that vast array of court lyrics gathered in the *cancioneros,* and their treatment accords with the thoroughgoing presentation by Menéndez y Pelayo. The pages devoted to Henrique de Villena, Juan de Mena, the Marqués de Santillana, and Fernán Pérez de Guzmán give summaries of the works of these men. The unobtrusive assertion (p. 32) that the extensive use of allegory during the first half of the fifteenth century is not wholly due to Italian models, but is rooted in the traditions of Christian Spain, deserves greater emphasis in view of the often stated and too generally accepted influence of Dante. The pages which contain the story of the rise of the Romances of Chivalry emphasize the reflection of their spirit in such works as the story of Don Pedro Niño, the *Paso honroso* of Suero de Quiñones, and the history of King Roderick (by Pedro del Corral); as regards the indebtedness of the latter "to the entire literature of the Romances of Chivalry," for his technique the reader is at once tempted to ask what these Romances (about 1440) could be and whether it is possible to assert that Corral knew the *Amadis* and the *Cifar.* The sources of such fantastic histories as Corral's are not easily discovered: the imagination does not always need definite models. Finally, the poetic creation of the depressing period of Henry IV is soundly characterized and closes the third period.

The fourth period (1474-1555) tells of the rise of Spain's "national" literature, and how it was stimulated by increasing currents of foreign forms and ideas. Especially in connection with this period it becomes apparent that no literary manual can be satisfactory unless certain characterizations are illuminated by means of examples and excerpts. From the point of view of the teacher, collateral reading by the student is indispensable and, as long as comprehensive anthologies of Spanish literature are not available, the teacher will be obliged to resort to manuals and assigned reading. For such a procedure Dr. Pfandl's book is well

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

suited, but one may offer as a stricture that it is not always wise to lay too great stress on foreign influence, lest the inexperienced student get the impression that there is little national or original in the Spanish field. The words 'influence' and 'model' are much abused in modern criticism and tend to undermine such interest as the student may develop in his reading, notably if he tries to concentrate on the value and beauty of the things in themselves. Spanish literature has distinct and original qualities, and yet one is too often led to overemphasize sources or models rather than the many qualities to be appreciated objectively.

After a brief introduction to this chapter, in which the author points out how the essence of the Spanish literary Renascence is to be found in classical and humanistic influences followed by that of Erasmus and his disciples, the chief names of the reigns of Ferdinand and Isabella and of Charles V are presented. As regards the *Romances* and the current theories of their origin and ancestry, a more extensive treatment would have been welcome, notably something more conclusive on the growing and probably justifiable belief that the *Romances* have a much older history than has been admitted by those who adhere to the opinion that they are only the remnants of longer epic forms. It is at least not impossible that brief songs of the character of the *Romances* were known as early as the oldest genuine epic narrative and possibly earlier. On page 63 the author of the first known edition of the *Amadis* should be given as Garci Rodríguez de Montalvo, according to the edition of Zaragoza, 1508: here it is not a question of subsequent editions; since the original *Amadis* had only three books, Montalvo added a fourth (not a "fünftes") book. The Esplandián was the fifth book (*cf.* p. 79). The date of the first edition of *Arnalte y Lucenda* (p. 64) is 1491, and the only known copy exists in the Library of the Academy of History at Madrid. The derogatory mention of Prescott (p. 66) is both unjust and irrelevant, and could well be omitted.

In dealing with the famous work known as the *Celestina,* the author speaks of the far-reaching influence of the book, in which he might well include the indebtedness to it of the *Dorotea* of Lope de Vega, the single work of greatest importance to any study of that author. How the influence of the *Celestina* on the *novela picaresca* was "befruchtend und anregend" is not clear. The

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

entire *genre* of this famous type can be conceived as quite unchanged if the *Celestina* had never been written. Very vaguely similar features and characters here and there are scarcely worth mentioning. Of these two types, the *Celestina* is in dialogue; its more elevated features are the fruits of humanism, its crass but powerful realism deals chiefly with the vices and crimes engendered by passion and immorality. Its important characters are women, chiefly of the underworld. The picaresque narratives present a cynical, unemotional biography of an adventurer who moves through all castes of society and lives by his wits. Technically or in substance the type has hardly anything in common with the various *Celestinas*. After speaking of the Pastoral Romance (p. 82), Dr. Pfandl follows the custom of other histories in alluding to "Moorish tales," as if these were a prominent and prolific class in the development of the novel. "Die etwa gleichzeitig entstehende maurische Erzählung, schon nicht mehr aus der Fremde eingebracht, ist nach Stoff und Darstellung bodenständige Heimatkunst. . . . Ritter-, Schäfer- und Maurenromane sind alle drei nur wechselnde Formen des idealistischen Dranges, der die ritterlichste aller Nationen beseelte." For examples of this type the author is obliged to fall back on the only known specimen, the *Historia de Abindarraez y Jarifa*. As a matter of fact, frontier narratives appear to have existed chiefly in oral tradition. Some are preserved in the *Romances fronterizos*, and certain Moorish legends were absorbed by such romantic compilations as Pérez de Hita's *Guerras Civiles de Granada;* but as a literary type with a large contribution to the history of the novel this kind of story never reached a real *Blüteperiode*. There were also Moorish themes invented by the playwrights and the lyric poets, but there never was a "maurische Erzählung" commensurable with the Romance of Chivalry or the Pastoral Tale.

It would be idle to emphasize all the features well treated. Yet an important question that rises is the distribution of space in so brief a history. One may doubt, for example, whether Antonio de Guevara deserves all the pages allotted to him (pp. 90-93). As regards his style and its influence, efforts to demonstrate the relation between the Spaniard, on the one hand, and Euphuism, Marinism, or the *style précieux,* on the other, have proved, as far as I know, quite sterile. As for Spain alone, the words *Guevarismo, conceptismo, culto, Gongorismo* are often used without sufficient

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

explanation of their meaning. They do not represent a definite chain of related developments; there is not the slightest evidence that *Gongorismo* in its purest form has any connection with Guevara's peculiar tricks of style. It is also wise to emphasize that the latter is a prose manifestation and the other purely one of lyric poetry.

The period of Charles V fitly closes with a thoughtful presentation of the brothers Juan and Alfonso de Valdés, whose contributions to Spanish culture and literature as humanists and speculative thinkers and reformers seldom receive the credit their noble work deserves.

The concluding portions of this book will be welcome. Should it ever be deemed worthy of a translation for more extended use among English-speaking people, some changes in the disposition of pages would be necessary, such as the breaking up of long paragraphs, the addition of subtitles and captions with perhaps here and there a regrouping of closely related themes which are now touched upon in two or three separate places. Numerous cross-references in the present form are indispensable.

The Bibliographical Appendix and the Index are useful. Mere reference to Ticknor, who is now out of date, but who was a worthy pioneer in his time, would have been sufficient without the uncritical repetition of Menéndez y Pelayo's derogatory exclamation, which was, after all, not uttered à propos of the entire work. It also seems illogical that Fitzmaurice-Kelly's *History* in its first Spanish translation should be either mentioned or recommended in view of the numerous corrections and additions of the edition of 1921. For the use of foreigners the first section of the Bibliography would have to be recast. The second part covers texts and studies; here one may assume that during these latter difficult years Dr. Pfandl was unable to see certain recent publications which would profitably replace or complete some of his titles. The Index, which includes the authors and works discussed, is a welcome aid to the reader.

RUDOLPH SCHEVILL.

University of California.

Digitized by Google

Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

Heinrich von Kleist's Conception of the Tragic. By WALTER SILZ, Ph. D. (Hesperia, Schriften zur germanischen Philologie, nr. 12). Baltimore, The Johns Hopkins Press, 1923.

This recent addition to the *Hesperia* series is a truly illuminating study not only of Kleist's conception of the tragic, but of the decisive phases of the poet's whole spiritual development. It sets out with his pre-Kantian state of implicit belief in a rational universe, a benevolent Providence, the objectivity of knowledge, and the attainability of happiness through methodical training of the will and conscious cultivation of a serene equilibrium of the soul. Had this state of mind continued, the author thinks, Kleist would probably never have become a poet and certainly not a tragic poet. He therefore sees in the terrible disillusionment, the shocking revelation of the subjectivity of all human opinion, wrought by the study of Kant, not, as has often been assumed, a destructive element in Kleist's career, but a great impelling power, the birth throes so to speak of his poetic genius.

From this point of view the author examines, in chronological order, Kleist's principal works, thereby establishing three successive phases in his conception of the essential tragedy of human life. The first phase comprises *Die Familie Schroffenstein, Robert Guiskard,* and *Amphitryon.* In these dramas, the individual appears as a victim of chance, as a plaything of powers outside of his control and beyond his understanding. In the *Familie Schroffenstein,* the incomprehensible working of circumstance sets different branches of the same noble family in blind hatred against each other, turning peaceful, well-intentioned people into traitors and murderers. The world reflected in this play is a madhouse, where the voice of reason is drowned out by the frantic cries of misunderstanding, error, and ignorance. In *Robert Guiskard,* a great ruler, a hero of world-wide fame, an invincible conqueror is felled by capricious Fate at the very zenith of his career, the moment when his victorious troops are storming the gates of Constantinople, the goal of his desire. His death is a stirring illustration of the irrationality of this world. For, as Dr. Silz points out against Meyer-Benfey and others, the plague to which Robert succumbs is not to be interpreted as a divine requital for his past acts, not as a tragedy which follows from his character. It is a blind, brutal

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

accident, entirely devoid of any moral significance whatsoever. In *Amphitryon,* the soul of a singularly pure and noble woman, Alcmene, is misled and vitiated by superhuman machination, the appearance of Zeus in her husband's shape, and is thereby plunged into such depths of confusion and inner tumult that death comes to her as the only way out. Here then again, if we accept Dr. Silz's interpretation of the play against the majority of critics, man appears as a helpless creature of outside forces which he can neither grasp nor influence.

In these three play with their hopeless view of human life as a prey to arbitrary caprice of powers other than human, Dr. Silz sees the first, violently upsetting effect of the catastrophe wrought in Kleist's mind by the *Critique of Pure Reason.* A certain rebounding from the shock received by it and an approach toward a deeper conception of life's tragedy he finds in a number of works among which *Penthesilea* stands out foremost. Here the individual struggles not so much with outer conditions as with himself, his limitations, his desires, his conflicting feelings. But although this second phase of Kleist's poetic development thus comes nearer to genuine tragedy of character, there is absent even from this phase any suggestion of tragic guilt or atonement. The tragic happenings remain mere calamities; the inner convulsion leads to sheer self-destruction; and there is no outlook into a realm of ideals attained by suffering. For even *Das Käthchen von Heilbronn,* which the author classes with this second phase, in spite of the serenity and childlike faith which pervade it, is "a consummate indictment of the disordered and unhappy state of the world in which we live, a powerful proof-by-contrast of the tragedy of human existence. Only in this fairy world is harmony of soul possible; so far must we come from reality to find happiness!"

In the last phase of his poetic career, the phase which produced *Michael Kohlhaas, Die Hermannsschlacht,* and *Der Prinz von Homburg,* Kleist reaches a conception of the tragic reconciling the individual with the world about him and thus restoring to Kleist himself, for a time at least, the equilibrium of mind which he had lost through the Kantian catastrophe. Kohlhaas, the just and upright citizen whom the failure of society to accord justice to him forces into rebellion against society, willingly accepts the death sentence and calmly lays his head on the block because he

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

feels that justice after all has triumphed. Hermann sacrifices everything, himself, his wife and children, his honor, his conception of right, his human feeling to the one idea of his country's freedom, and through this sacrifice creates a new order of national existence. Prince Friedrich, the reckless egoist, the phantastic dreamer, the vacillating sentimentalist, becomes a man, a hero, by submitting to the stern law of the moral self and the wholesome discipline of public duty, and thus reëstablishes his own right to a place in the larger life surrounding him.

It was the culminating tragedy of Kleist's personal career that the harmony of soul which he thus finally succeeded in winning for the children of his poetic imagination, did not stay by him in the conduct of his own life, but forsook him at the moment when he needed it most.

I cannot conclude this brief analysis of Dr. Silz's monograph without expressing the hope that this young scholar of mature insight and deliberate judgment will some day come to stand in the front rank of our profession.

KUNO FRANCKE.

Harvard University.

Goethe's Political Interests prior to 1787. By FRANK HERMAN REINSCH. (Univ. Calif. Publ. Mod. Phil., x, No. 3, pp. 183-278). Univ. of California Press, Berkeley, California, 1923.

This University of California doctoral dissertation offers us a new bit of proof that literary critics and historians, especially those dealing with German literature, are turning more and more to the sociological aspects of their subject. On the basis of a reexamination of old evidence—the works themselves of Goethe, especially *Dichtung und Wahrheit* and the letters—Dr. Reinsch shows, from the point of view of modern ideas of sociology and politics, that Goethe was far more interested in social and political movements, official life, law and politics, social reform and questions of diplomacy than the average Goethe biographer has been prone to admit. The only comparatively new evidence used consists of a few random references to the *Schemata zur Fortsetzung von Dichtung und Wahrheit* published by Kurt Jahn in *Goethe-*

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

Jahrbuch, XXVIII, 6 ff. Within these limits Dr. Reinsch has done his work with great care and assiduity and has helped to make clear many a point that has hitherto been obscure or misunderstood.

There is always a temptation in a work such as the one under consideration for the author to overemphasize his particular side of the case (strong as it may be *per se*) to the prejudice of the other side. It seems that Dr. Reinsch has, in some instances at least, succumbed to this temptation. Such an instance is found in Goethe's correspondence with Kestner late in 1773 and early in 1774, when the latter, established in an official post at Hanover, gave Goethe hope of a similar position there but failed to carry out his promise. Reinsch here ascribes a feeling of disappointment to Goethe, intimating that he was very eager to secure the post. This is rather doubtful. Only a few weeks before Goethe had written to Kestner: "unter all meinen Talenten ist meine Jurisprudenz der geringsten eins."[1]

Many other passages could be quoted from the letters tending to show that Goethe was not exactly the ardent enthusiast for things political that the author would make him out to be. The following two passages, quoted by Reinsch himself, but probably possessing much more significance than he gives them, are in point. To Frau von Stein: "Wieviel wohler wäre mir's wenn ich von dem Streit der politischen Elemente abgesondert, in deiner Nähe, meine Liebste, den Wissenschafften and Künsten wozu ich geboren bin, meinen Geist zuwenden könnte."[2] Again to Frau von Stein: "Ich binn recht zu einem Privatmenschen erschaffen und begreiffe nicht wie mich das Schicksal in eine Staatsverwaltung und eine fürstliche Familie hat einflicken mögen."[3] After all, do not these passages represent more accurately the true immortal Goethe as we are rightly wont to picture him, Goethe, the poet, the man of letters, the thinker? Nor was it especially his political activity that made Goethe happy. "Ich würde in dem geringsten Dorfe und auf einer wüsten Insel eben so betriebsam seyn müssen um nur zu leben," he writes to Knebel on December 3, 1781.[4] That he always considered writing as his true forte can be

[1] *Werke* (Weimar), IV, 2, 135 f.
[2] June 4, 1782. *Werke*, IV, 5, 337.
[3] September 17, 1782. *Werke*, IV, 6, 58.
[4] *Werke*, IV, 5, 228.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

amply documented. Compare the letter to Kestner of May 14, 1780.[5]

To the reviewer it is a valid objection that the author leans too heavily upon *Dichtung und Wahrheit* for his evidence. For whatever may be said in favor of this great autobiographical fragment, there is no denying that some forty years had elapsed between its composition and the events that it describes *ex post facto.* Its inordinate, often uncritical use by Goethe biographers is an old traditional weakness of Goethe philology which has probably given many an uncontrollable myth the stamp of authenticity.

For the sake of greater completeness it would have been well to pay more attention also to Goethe's attitude toward foreign political events. His reaction to the American Revolution—to quote only a single example—would have been worth discussing at greater length once more.

The dissertation is written in a clear, lucid English style which is marred only by the all too frequent but under the circumstances unavoidable German quotations. The clause "Goethe justifies the inference that he felt and responded to the democratic tendencies" (p. 209, lines 12-13) is only a minor stylistic slip. The following misprints have been noticed: p. 210, line 5 from bot.: Die jenige (hyphen missing); p. 210, footnote 159: *for* XXXVI *read* XXXVIII; p. 236, footnote 262: *for* 1871 *read* 1781; p. 243, line 3: *for* Lavater *read* Kestner; p. 243, footnote 310: *for* 1872 *read* 1782; p. 246, line 2 from bot.: *for* Winkelmann *read* Winckelmann; p. 278, line 5 from bot.: *for* Thomas, C., A History of German Literature, London, 1909 *read* Thomas, C., The History of German Literature, New York, 1909.

It is to be hoped that Dr. Reinsch will continue his useful investigation, extending it to the much more difficult and perplexing latter half of Goethe's life. In that case he will probably do well to devote more space to Goethe's imaginative works, too, and to find access to the material still lying unpublished in Weimar. This material would undoubtedly also furnish much additional evidence for the present sixth chapter on diplomacy.

EDWIN H. ZEYDEL.

Indiana University.

[5] *Werke*, IV, 4, 221.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

Volney et l'Amérique, d'après des documents inédits et sa correspondance avec Jefferson. By GILBERT CHINARD. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press, and Paris: Les Presses Universitaires, 1923. 207 pp.

This monograph is the first of a projected series called *The Johns Hopkins Studies in Romance Literatures and Languages,* under the general editorship of D. S. Blondheim, Gilbert Chinard, and H. Carrington Lancaster, whose names are sufficient guarantee that the new series will contain much to interest Romance scholars. Announcement is made that other studies are in preparation by various contributors, including several on Chateaubriand, one on the *Reyes Magos,* one on Corneille, and two on the influence of Cervantes in France during the first half of the seventeenth century. Such a series will be a welcome addition to our present all too limited facilities for the printing of material too extended in scope for the periodicals.

Literary relations between France and America are still not well known and offer a fruitful field for careful study. Professor Chinard, whose studies of American exoticism as found in French literature need no introduction, has in recent years turned his attention toward the reverse of the medal: namely, toward certain aspects of the impact of French thought upon America. In the midst of extended studies, the results of which are shortly to be published under the title of *Jefferson et la France,* Mr. Chinard has detached certain parts having to do with Volney's relations with America and has published them under the title, *Volney et l'Amérique.* The result is a study prepared with the author's usual care and intelligence. It cannot of course have the same interest as is to be expected from the promised work on Jefferson, but that is due only to the fact that Volney is of smaller stature, and not at all to any inadequacy of presentation. No one interested in Franco-American relations can afford to neglect this book. Many more similarly excellent monographs, let us hope, will gradually come to be devoted to this general field, so that some day may be written a *travail d'ensemble,* which the present state of our knowledge on this subject renders impossible. Mr. Chinard has brought for the future edifice a solid corner stone and promises in the near future another which will certainly be even more important.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

The man, whose real name was Chassebeuf, until his father christened him more aristocratically Boisgirais, and who finally called himself—no one knows quite how or why—Volney, was born in 1757 and died in 1820. He was, as Mr. Chinard points out at the beginning, "ni un très grand esprit, ni un très grand écrivain," but, "tel qu'il est, il occuperait dans la littérature une place mieux marquée s'il n'avait eu aux yeux de la postérité le très grand tort d'écrire sur les mêmes sujets que Chateaubriand." [1] In the salon of Mme Helvétius he came in contact with Franklin by whose practical philosophy he was to some extent influenced.[2] A journey to the Orient narrated as a *Voyage en Syrie et en Egypte* in 1787, brought him some reputation, augmented by the more famous, but now nearly forgotten, *Ruines et méditations sur les révolutions des empires* in 1791. During the French Revolution he played a rôle of a certain slight importance. He next became a professor at the newly founded Ecole Normale, where his "leçons d'histoire" gave proof of a scientific interest in facts and exact observation. Shortly, however, the Ecole Normale was suppressed and Volney departed for América. He arrived at Philadelphia October 12, 1795, studied English, visited Jefferson, Madison, Washington, and other important men, traveled through Virginia, then west to Gallipolis in Ohio, to see what this "city of the French" was like, next to Lexington and Louisville in Kentucky and on to Fort Vincennes on the border of Indiana and Illinois, where was then another French colony, finally back through Lexington, Cincinnati, Detroit, Niagara, Albany to Philadelphia, which he reached early in November, 1796.[3] A projected voyage to Boston, abandoned this time, was made the following spring.[4] In the midst of the anti-French reaction, in bad odor with President John Adams, at odds with the orthodox party in Philadelphia because of his anti-religious views, Volney left America in disillusionment early in June of 1798. He had lived in America two years and eight months.

Volney, convinced that the French colonists he had seen in America were less fitted for the wilderness than the English—

[1] G. Chinard, *Volney et l'Amérique*, p. 11.

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 12. Cf. pp. 19-21.

[3] *Ibid.*, p. 52.

[4] *Ibid.*, pp. 57, 84.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

"voisiner et causer sont, pour les Français, un besoin si impérieux, que sur toute la frontière de la Louisiane et du Canada l'on ne saurait citer un colon de cette nation, établi hors de la portée et de la vue d'un autre," [5]—advised Napoleon, much to his displeasure at first, to cede Louisiana to the United States. Volney's opinion had its influence with the Dictator after all, so that, secondary figure as Volney was, he yet played his part in these important negotiations of such far-reaching consequences for the New World. As early as 1790 he had begun to touch American affairs, for he had suggested to Jefferson in writing a whole plan of campaign against the Barbary pirates, which was not adopted until Jefferson himself became President.[6] This interesting and important paper appears in the Appendix to Mr. Chinard's monograph.

Part of Volney's *Ruines* was translated by Jefferson, thus showing a certain sympathy, far from complete, with Volney's unorthodox point of view.[7] Mr. Chinard shows us Volney forecasting to a certain extent the various inquiry bureaux of the League of Nations,[8] using the questionnaire method of collecting data,[9] investigating, after Jefferson, the subject of winds,[10] drawing up a vocabulary of the language of the Miamis and advocating the compilation of similar works for the other Indian languages, for "en 100 ans peut-être plusieurs tribus actuelles auront totalement disparu," [11] counseling also in the same letter exact measurements "du statut de la chute du Niagara, afin de servir par la suite de terme de comparaison à ses progrès ultérieurs," foreseeing the future development of the Middle West,[12] reacting against the idea that the Americans are a people without tradition,[13] anticipating Tocqueville in attributing the success of American democracy in great part to the people's good fortune in having a new and practically uninhabited country to develop, "un pays *vide*," [14] combating the conception of the idyllic savage as portrayed by Rousseau and Chateaubriand,[15] attacking the *Discours sur l'inégalité* as fundamentally false in its attitude of hostility toward private property,[16]

[5] *Ibid.*, pp. 135, 154-55.
[6] *Ibid.*, pp. 16-17, Appendix, pp. 189-96.
[7] *Ibid.*, pp. 113-18.
[8] *Ibid.*, p. 25.
[9] *Ibid.*, p. 23.
[10] *Ibid.*, pp. 58, 62.
[11] *Ibid.*, p. 137. Cf. p. 170.
[12] *Ibid.*, p. 53.
[13] *Ibid.*, p. 151.
[14] *Ibid.*, pp. 151-52.
[15] *Ibid.*, pp. 156-59.
[16] *Ibid.*, p. 158.

Digitized by Google
Original from
UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

going beyond Montesquieu's over-simplified theory of climate and discovering in the United States "des infinités de climats" with a consequently varied effect upon the people,[17] impartially pointing out what seemed to him the superiority of the Anglo-Saxons as colonists over the French,[18] traveling slowly and often painfully, now on foot, now on horseback, without baggage, over country that Chateaubriand would seem to have traversed in some cases almost too easily to be credited,[19] in short an intelligent and scientifically observant traveler, filled with interesting and enlightening ideas, which in this brief summary can only be hinted at, but which Professor Chinard has now made accessible.

Most of the letters between Volney and Jefferson are here given for the first time from unpublished manuscripts in the Library of Congress. The proof reading has not been impeccable, but the occasional errors are of such small importance that it is hardly worth while to point them out here.

George R. Havens.

Ohio State University.

CORRESPONDENCE

Notes on the *Writing Scholar's Companion* (1695).

The following notes are published primarily to supplement Ekwall's *Introduction* to the reprint (Max Niemeyer, Halle, 1911) of the *Writing Scholar's Companion* (Neudrucke Frühneuenglischer Grammatiken, herausgegeben von R. Brotanek; Band 6). Curiously enough, this volume of Brotanek's series has never been reviewed, although of considerable interest in many ways; the publication of these notes, then, may serve also as a recognition, however belated, of the value of this contribution of Ekwall's to our knowledge of English phonology.—References are to page for the *Introduction* (Roman numerals), to page and line for the reprint itself (Arabic numerals).

P. iv. The vulgar pron. *Chorles* for *Charles,* p. 86, l. 20, is worthy of note. If the spelling *Chorles* represents a pron. [tš · lz], the phonetic development is parallel to that in *palsy*. Cf. also *Marlborough.*

[17] *Ibid.*, pp. 144, 149.

[18] *Ibid.*, p. 153. Cf. pp. 154 and 155, n.

[19] *Ibid.*, pp. 39, 44-46.

Digitized by Google | Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

P. vi. Both [e] and [i] are still used in *again*—the latter only as a vulgarism, it is true. For the [æ] of *plaited* see the *NED*.—On p. 111 *lair* is given under "(ir). Sounded (ur)." This probably means a pron. [le·ər], and is to be compared with the [-aiər] of *fire* etc., p. 25.

P. vii. Under "Words of Like Sound but Different Sence, and Various Spelling and Writing" *err* and *ere* are paired, p. 92, l. 3, which sems to show that *prefer* was "thoughtlessly taken over from Cooper," as Ekwall surmises.

P. viii. The pron. [ə] in the strest syllable of *stirrup, squirrel* (and *syrup*) is still current—in the United States, at least.

P. ix. See p. 92, where "A *Form* of Words" and "A *Fourm* to sit on" are distinguished. The distinction is parallel to that between *born* and *borne*.

P. xiii. Under "ME. *ū*" Ekwall observes: "There is a curious rule p. 38: '*ou* sounds broad like *oa* in *course, discourse, fourth.*' I suppose *oa* is a misprint for *oo;* for [u·] is the pronunciation we should expect. It is impossible that *oa* should denote [o·], for immediately after the words quoted follows this rule: '[*ou* sounds] like *o* long in *four*'; *o* long is evidently [o·]. Against my explanation it may be objected that the adjective 'broad' is elsewhere only used of the sound [ɔ·]; but evidently this sound cannot be meant, and *oa* should certainly not be altered to *au*."—Against this theory of Ekwall's are to be brought the following considerations. In the first place, in the only case where the author uses a descriptive adjective with unquestionable reference to [u·], viz., on p. 28, l. 13, he calls the sound "obscure," not "broad." Secondly, on p. 39 (§ 11), in connection with [o·, ɔ·], he seems to use "broad" and "long" as equivalent in meaning, from which it is natural to assume that "broad *oa*" in the present case means "long *o*," i. e., [o·], since [ɔ·] is out of the question. Thirdly, elsewhere—probably p. 27, certainly p. 39—he does not distinguish [o·] and [ɔ·], on p. 39 calling both sounds both "long" and "broad," and this in the same sentence—not because he confused them in pron., of course, but because he did not use a strict and consistent terminology, and was interested primarily in spelling. Lastly, the apparent contrast which he makes between the pron. of *four* and that of *fourth* is probably only apparent—it is extremely unlikely that these words, always so closely associated, had become differentiated phonetically. The apparent contrast may easily be explained on the basis of the author's interest in spelling—he simply wished to call attention to the homonyms *four* and *fore*. To be thoroughgoing he ought, it is true, to have mentioned *fourth:forth* as well, but one must not expect too much of a 17th cy. orthoepist!

P. xiv. The [au] of *bouze* p. 89 is worthy of note, in view of the present pron. with [u·].—The mistakes in spelling (*yeusless,*

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

yeusary) p. 87, as also the "homonyms" *adieu: adoo* p. 88, are of value in determining the author's pron.

P. xv. In the 8th line, for *35* read *26*.—As to the pron. of *buoy* see p. 89, where "*Boy*, Lad: *Buoy* of an Anchor" are given as homonyms.

P. xx. The homonyms *hach* (= *hash*, of course): *harsh* p. 93 are worthy of note.

Kemp Malone.

The Johns Hopkins University.

Diderot's Earliest Publication

Diderot's biographers are unanimous in stating that he began his literary career with the translation of Stanyan's *Grecian History* and of Shaftesbury's *Inquiry concerning Virtue* (*Essai sur le Mérite et la Vertu*) which appeared in 1743 and 1745. It is also generally accepted that before 1749 he did not sign any of his publications.[1] Yet neither of these two translations is his earliest publication and his name appeared in print as early as 1741. A periodical of 1741, *Le Perroquet*,[2] which was issued in Francfort, "chez François Varrentrap," contains on p. 78 a poem signed *P. D. Diderot*, which, in view of its date, is his earliest known publication. Moreover, it must be noted that it is signed by his full name.

This poem, which bears the title: *Epître à M. B. . . . .*, has been reprinted in the *Correspondance littéraire* of Grimm and Diderot in December, 1787, as *Epître à M. Boisard par feu M. Diderot.*[3] From there is was gathered into the complete works of Diderot,[4] but the editor's footnote throws a good deal of doubt upon the correctness of the identification of M. B. as Monsieur Boisard: "Il est probable que ces vers qui se trouvent dans la *Correspondance* de Grimm de décembre 1787, et qui ont été publiés par Anguis, sans nom de destinataire, ne sont pas adressés à Boisard, l'auteur des *Fables* publiées en 1773. Celui-ci n'avait point à se plaindre de la fortune,[5] puisqu'il fut successivement secrétaire de l'intendance de Normandie, secrétaire du conseil des finances de Monsieur, comte de Provence, et secrétaire du sceau et de la chancellerie de ce prince. Cette pièce est assurément adressée à un jeune homme.

[1] *Œuvres de Diderot*. Ed. Assézat, XIII; and the works on Diderot by Scherer J. Morley, L. Ducros, Rosenkranz, and A. Collignon.

[2] The issue was reprinted in one volume in 1742. A copy in the library of the University of Minnesota.

[3] The poem is in the edition Buisson, 1813, IV, 402, but has not been reprinted in the edition Tourneux, 1881.

[4] Ed. Assézat, IX, 63.

[5] The poem refers to the poverty of M. B.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

Nous pensons donc qu'il s'agit plutôt de Boisard, nevue du précédent, né en 1762, d'abord peintre, puis poète. Il a pu connaître Diderot de 1782 à 1784; mais les souhaits du philosophe n'ont pas forcé la main à la Fortune. Emigré, puis rentré en France et condamné à mort en 1793, Boisard n'échappa à l'exécution de cette sentence que pour mener une existence malheureuse jusqu' à la rentrée des Bourbons, époque à laquelle il écrivit aussi des *Fables* qu'il dédia au roi."

Now, since Diderot's *Epître* was published as early as 1741, it cannot have been addressed to any of the two Boisards mentioned in this note, for they were born respectively in 1743 and in 1762.[6] It is only in 1787, after Diderot's death that the *Epître à M. B.* has been interpreted as *Epître à Monsieur Boisard.* The interpretation is probably incorrect, but even if the poem was written for a M. Boisard, it is neither of the two indicated by Assézat's footnote.

GUSTAVE L. VAN ROOSBROECK.

New York University.

THE THREE FRANCIS BEAUMONTS.

In Professor Carpenter's excellent *Guide to Spenser,*[1] we find:

"Beaumont, Francis (1584-1616). A Letter from B., printed in Lady Newdigate-Newdegate's Gossip from a Muniment-Room. Lond. 1898. 132.

Cf. Lounsbury's Chaucer, III, 59; C. M. Gayley, Francis Beaumont. Lond. 1914. See index, esp. p. 44."

The dates here given show that the letter is attributed to Francis Beaumont, the dramatist. The letter in question is one from a Francis Beaumont to Lady Anne Newdegate (Anne Fitton) c. 1611-12. Now the various allusions to kinsmen, etc. in the series of euphuistic letters by Beaumont, "wordy and overflowing with compliments," of which this letter is but one, show conclusively, as Lady Newdigate-Newdegate points out,[2] that this Francis Beaumont was neither the poet nor the poet's father (of the same name), but the later Master of the Charterhouse, to which information Professor Gayley adds, on what authority I do not know, that he was "A relative and namesake of the dramatist's father." Thus

[6] On the first Boisard see G. Saillard, *Essai sur la Fable en France au XVIIIe siècle.* 1912, p. 87 sq.

[1] Carpenter, F. I., *A Reference Guide to Spenser*, 231.

[2] Lady Newdigate-Newdegate, *op. cit.*, 139; see for instance 99 and notes to pages 126, 127, etc.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

the praise of Spenser in this letter is not to be credited to Francis Beaumont, the dramatist.

Not only so, but Carpenter's reference is likely to raise another ghost, once happily laid by Lady Newdigate.[3] In the Lounsbury reference, the letter by Francis Beaumont prefixed to Speght's edition of Chaucer, 1598, is attributed to "the dramatist Beaumont." To the objections of Lady Newdigate, accepted by Professor Gayley,[4] may be added a conclusive one. In this letter to Speght, Beaumont speaks of "those auncient learned men of our time in Cambridge."[5] Now Speght was connected with Peterhouse, Cambridge, 1566-73.[6] It is thus a physical impossibility that the author of the letter could have been Francis Beaumont, the dramatist, born 1584. Hence the praise of Chaucer in this letter is not to be credited to the dramatist.

This narrows the field of candidates for authorship of the Chaucer letter to Judge Francis Beaumont, father of the poet; and to the former's namesake, later Master of Charterhouse. Miss Spurgeon, not knowing the work of Lady Newdigate, enters Judge Beaumont for the honor,[7] but seems puzzled by the fact that the letter "somewhat expanded, appeared again in Speght's edn. of 1602, though Beaumont died in 1598." The conclusion is clear; the author was not Judge Beaumont but the later Master of Charterhouse.

The same thing is made clear by the Cambridge records. "Judge" Beaumont was admitted a fellow commoner of Peterhouse March 6, 1563-4, was so recorded at Queen Elizabeth's visit in August 1564, though he neither matriculated nor took any degrees, but by 1572 became a member of parliament.[8] Thus Judge Beaumont could not have been the man. Speght's "coetanean" and college chum was:[9]

> "Beaumont or Beamond, Francis (*junior*). Matric. pens. from Peterhouse, Easter 1565; B. A. 1569-70; M. A. 1573. Probably Master of the Charterhouse, 1617-24. . . . Died June 18, 1624."

Speght and Beaumont were thus college mates practically throughout their college course.

It will be noticed that the account above considers this Francis

[3] Newdigate, *op. cit.*, 139.
[4] Gayley, *Beaumont*, 24.
[5] Spurgeon, *Five Hundred Years of Chaucer Criticism*, I, 146.
[6] *D. N. B.*, Speght.
[7] Spurgeon, *op. cit.*, I, 146, note.
[8] Venn, *Alumni Cantabrigienses;* Cooper, *Athenae Cantabrigienses*, II, 246.
[9] Venn, *op. cit.;* Cooper, *op. cit.*, III, 70 ascribes the career of this Francis Beaumont to the Judge.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

as probably the later Master of Charterhouse. That the identification is correct, I think is clear from "Master" Beaumont's frequent allusion to Chaucer, pointed out by Lady Newdigate but not known to Miss Spurgeon. The gallantly pedantic old beau c. 1611-12 fears to be drawn into "Palamon's error," [10] and alludes to Lady Newdegate's daughter as "little Lady Emilie." In his vicarious despair c. 1612, "But like as Troilus once said, so I say:

> All this I did, and I can do no more;
> She cruel is and woe is me therefore."

A whimsical old gallant was Francis Beaumont, still living in his Cambridge world of the sixties when some great unknown impressed upon him, and Speght, and Spenser (Pembroke 1569-1576) [11] the greatness of Chaucer; and still speaking the early ornate idiom cultivated by Sydney and Lyly, then the rage but now a source of laughter to such young bloods as his relative the dramatist. It is clear then that the credit of these words of appreciation for Chaucer and Spenser belongs neither to Judge Beaumont, nor to his son the dramatist; but to "Master" Beaumont.

T. W. BALDWIN.

Goucher College.

BOVÉE'S *Première Année de Français*. A REPLY

The February number of *Modern Language Notes* contains a review by Mr. R. W. Williams of Bovée: *Première Année de Français,* which is open to criticism in several respects. Mr. Williams states that there is no index and that the demonstrative pronoun is not taught. He has evidently overlooked the fact that there is an index combined with the vocabulary, reference to which shows that the demonstrative pronouns are taught on pages 442-444. It seems that Mr. Williams has not sufficiently taken into account the purpose for which the book was written. His criticism, that the rule "il faut employer *de* après la forme négative" does not cover all possible cases, is out of place when applied to a book specially planned for the first year in High School. Indeed, it is the addition of if's and but's to the fundamental rule which defeats the purpose of the average first year book. "One questions when the pupils would begin to read," he says. Definite provision is made for reading in the third term of the year. Up to that time

[10] Newdigate, *op. cit.*, 123, 135, 137.
[11] DeSelincourt, *Oxford Spenser*, xvii, note 1.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

abundant material has been furnished in the lessons themselves. "In the first fifty lessons only the present tense is taught." But this includes, in the first ten weeks of school, three forms (*je, il, vous*) of the present tense of fifteen of the most common irregular verbs, surely no small achievement! Mr. Williams' assumption that "it is highly impractical to expect beginners to grasp the mass of phonetic material hurled at their unanalytical heads" does not hold true in fact. In my experience children of thirteen have no difficulty in assimilating this pronetic material which is very gradually introduced, and, moreover, it gives them something tangible on which to base their ideas of French pronunciation. The criticism that the book is confused finds no corroboration when it is used in class. In actual practice the grammatical principles stand out clearly. The comment of the pupils using it is all to this effect. Their genuine appreciation of it is the best proof of its suitability.

EUNICE R. GODDARD.

Bryn Mawr School, Baltimore, Md.

BRIEF MENTION

In the summer of 1922 the firm of H. Haessel in Leipzig inaugurated a series of monographs entitled *Die Schweiz im deutschen Geistesleben,* under the general editorship of Professor Harry Maync, of Bern. The titles of some of the earlier volumes will show the scope of the series: *Historische Volkslieder der deutschen Schweiz,* by Otto von Greyerz; *Salomon Gessners Dichtungen,* by Hermann Hesse; *Conrad Ferdinand Meyers Gedichte,* by Eduard Korrodi; *Nietzsche und die Schweiz,* by Carl Albrecht Bernouilli; *Albrecht v. Hallers Gedichte,* by Harry Maync; *Klopstock und die Schweiz,* by Albert Köster; *Die Dichterschule von St. Gallen,* by Samuel Singer; *Zacharias Werner, Der vierundzwanzigste Februar,* by Eugen Kilian.

The most recent number is Emil Ermatinger's *Wieland und die Schweiz* (1924). In the compass of 111 pages the author gives a compact and succinct account of Wieland's connection with Switzerland. Successive chapters describe the young author's endeavors to win the favor of Bodmer, his sojourn at the latter's house, the estrangement, the new gods, the departure from Zürich, and the stay at Bern. A concise bibliography concludes the book.

Only one or two minor inadvertences have been noticed: on p. 17, *Die Natur der Dinge* is said to have been printed in 1751; this is literally correct, since Wieland had a copy as early as Dec. 20, 1751, but the date of the book is 1752. Again a long passage on p. 11 is ascribed to "Breitinger 1740 in seiner 'Kritischen Dicht-

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

kunst'"—the passage in question, however, is from the *Vorrede* of the *Critische Dichtkunst,* written, not by Breitinger, but by "Johann Jakob Bodemer," as the title expressly states.

Ermatinger's little book is interestingly, even fascinatingly written. It should appeal not only to the scholar, but also to the cultured general reader. W. K.

The gradual revival of German studies has called forth a number of new publications, both grammars and texts. The most recent among these is an edition by Professor Price of Johann Elias Schlegel's charming rococo comedy *Die stumme Schönheit.* (New York, Henry Holt & Co., 1924. xv + 87 pp.)

The editing of the play seems in part to have been suggested by the desire to furnish material for dramatic performances by students. Illustrations are accordingly provided from photographs of a Berkeley performance in the year 1917. An Introduction, written in simple German, gives an outline of the literary history of the play. In view of the detail covered by some of the footnotes of this Introduction it is a matter for surprise that nothing is said of style and metrics. So far as my experience goes, only the student of French, or, rather, the advanced student of French, is likely to have a conception of what is meant by the Alexandrine. For that matter, one could point out that our editor's text and the meter are at odds in several passages and that hence—in view of the absolute rigidity of the Alexandrine verse—the text must in these cases be retouched. Thus in line 201 the reading must be *gehn* and not *gehen;* in line 202 *Verzeihn* and not *Verzeihen;* in line 360 *Zutraun* and not *Zutrauen;* in line 489 *red't* and not *redet.* Perhaps the editor might defend some of these changes (for such they are, Muncker having, in each instance, the correct form) on the ground of a modernization of the text (Preface), but such a redaction is, of course, totally inadmissible when it runs contrary to metrical requirements. Besides, enough elided-vowel forms have been let stand, thus e. g. *red't* itself occurs in line 716. Similarly, under the head of style it would have been worth while to call attention to the striking instances of stichomythia in the latter half of the play (lines 395 ff., 633 ff.). Again, in connection with the *dramatis personae* it should have been pointed out somewhere that two of the names are meant to be significant: *Jungwitz* and *Praatgern,* the latter having as its first component part the verb 'praten,' cognate with the English 'prate' and 'prattle.' The garrulity of Frau Praatgern is evident enough from the text of the play. The fact that the little volume carries no Notes, the Vocabulary doing duty for both Notes and Vocabulary, may perhaps be pleaded in extenuation of these shortcomings.

In connection with the stage directions two curious errors have

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

slipped in. The name *Lakonius* between lines 556 and 557 should have been in small type and been enclosed within the brackets, the speech that follows being a continuation of Kathrine's lines, whereas the printed text would have them spoken by Lakonius. A similar mistake occurs after line 661 in a stage direction affecting Leonore.

Matters of punctuation always leave room for a difference of opinion, less, however, in the case of German than English. At any rate, in line 31 a colon, not a semicolon, is required after *Ernst.* I can also see no good reason for the omission of an interrogation in line 701, although the text here is in agreement with Muncker.

The Vocabulary seems on the whole to be adequate, but the reviewer is inclined to think that Professor Price underestimates the colloquial and dialectic (North German) peculiarities of the playlet. Thus Muncker, quite properly, deems it necessary to paraphrase line 479: *Ich bin es auch nicht längst gewesen* — *Es ist auch noch nicht zum längsten her, dasz ich es gewesen bin,* a meaning that is not adequately provided for by the *long since* of the Vocabulary. In line 696 *keine* has the older sense of *any. Zeit genug,* in line 391, means *soon enough.* For *endlich* in line 499 ('definitiv') see Paul's *Deutsches Wörterbuch.* The word *bedenken* in line 519 means *to remember one in the way of making a gift.* In line 176 *übergehn* means *to cross,* i. e., by boat, not 'to go,' as the Vocabulary has it.

B. J. V.

Songs and Ballads of the Maine Lumberjacks with Other Songs from Maine. Collected and edited by Roland P. Gray (Cambridge, Harvard University Press, 1924). In this exquisitely printed book Professor Gray gives some fifty songs and ballads gleaned while he was teaching in the University of Maine. Several of these are of outstanding importance, particularly those that are versions of the old ballads. It is interesting to find others, well known in this country, that had their origin in Maine. In addition several broadsides have been included. A modern selection, "The Dying Hobo," fortunately is given, as is "Fair Charlotte"—a piece containing stanzas of rare merit.

The introductory notes, historical and bibliographical material will be of value to students. The "find" connected with "The Jam of Gerry's Rock" will have to be taken seriously into account in any discussion of the origin of popular ballads.

Mr. Gray has done a distinct service in rescuing these songs, for "soon it will be too late to gather them; those who know them are rapidly passing on. Even now the type of lumberjack of fifty years ago is hard to find" (p. xx).

E. P. K.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

INDEX

PAGE

Actrices françaises 297
African Novels of Bertrand.... 115
Aldrich-Foster Roulé, Elementary French 106
Allard, L., La Comédie de mœurs en France au dix-neuvième siècle 444
Allegorical Figure 89
America, Novel of Democracy in, 178
——, Volney and — 499
Amerval, Eloy D', *Le Livre de la déablerie* 173
Analytic Exposition 127
Apparitions in *Macbeth* 345, 383
"Areytos" in Sidney's *Defence of Poesy* 121
Art of Writing 98
Arthurian Parallel 307
—— Romance 482
Arvin, N. C., Eugène Scribe and the French Theatre 444
As You Like It, Shakespeare's, 447
Austin, H. D., Dante Notes, IV, 338

Bach, M. G.: T. M. Campbell, Hebbel, Ibsen and the Analytic Exposition 127
Bacourt, P. de, and J. W. Cunliffe, French Literature during the Last Half-Century ... 305
Baldwin, T. W., Shakespeare's Jester: The Dates of *Much Ado* and *As You Like It* 447
——, The Three Francis Beaumonts 505
Ballads, Songs and — 510
Balzac, Honoré de 65
——, The Wisdom of — 446
Balzac's *César Birotteau* 414
——'s Rate of Production 26
Bauwens, J., La Tragédie française et le théâtre hollandais au dix-septième siècle 364
Bazin, R., *Une Tache d'Encre* .. 109
Beatty, A., William Wordsworth, his Doctrine and Art in their Historical Relations, 59
Beatty, J. M., Jr., Doctor Johnson and 'Mur' 82
Beaumont, Francis 505
Beaunier, A., Joseph Joubert, Lettres à Mme de Vintimille, 53

PAGE

Becker, Ph. A., Festschrift 367
Beethoven Symphony in Balzac's *César Birotteau* 414
Beggar's Bush, The 379
Behaghel, O., *Heliand und Genesis* 50
Bel Ami and Madame Walter .. 185
Belden, H. M., *The Jew's Daughter* and the Myth of Zagreus, 161
Bell, C. H., *Helmbrecht*, 1251 .. 372
Bement, N. S., Balzac's Rate of Production 26
Beowulf 1422 77
Beresford, J., The Poems of Charles Cotton 241
Bertrand's, Louis, African Novels 115
Beza, Grimald and — 388
Birnam Wood 244
Blake and Seventeenth Century Authors 142
Blankenagel, J. C., A Wieland Quotation by H. v. Kleist ... 442
Bleheris and the Tristram Story 319
Bodmer, French Source of — .. 434
—— Indebted to Dante 247
Boissonnade, P., Du Nouveau sur la *Chanson de Roland* ... 166
Bolte, J., Johannes Pauli's *Schimpf und Ernst* 314
Bordeaux, H., *La Peur de Vivre*, 109
Bovée's Première Année de Français 108, 507
Bowen, R. P.: D. C. Cabeen, The African Novels of Louis Bertrand 115
Braune, W., Die Neudrucke Deutscher Literaturwerke 212
Briggs, W. D., On the Meaning of the Word 'Lake' in Marlowe's *Edward II* 437
——, First Song in *The Beggar's Bush* 379
Bright, J. W.: A. Beatty, William Wordsworth, his Doctrine and Art in their Historical Relations 59
Brooks, N. C., Notes on Performances of French Mystery Plays 276

Digitized by Google

Original from
UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

PAGE

Brown, C., Religious Lyrics of the XIVth Century 419
Bruce, J. D., The Evolution of Arthurian Romance 482
Brunot, F., La Pensée et la Langue 229
Buffum, D. L.: P. Boissonnade, Du Nouveau sur la *Chanson de Roland* 166
Bullock, W. L., Some Notes to a Note 309
——, The First French Sonnets, 475
Byzantine Source of Shakespeare's *Othello* 156

Cabeen, D. C., The African Novels of Louis Bertrand 115
Campbell, K.: F. A. Litz, Father Tabb: A Study of his Life and Works 361
Campbell, T. M., Hebbel, Ibsen and the Analytic Exposition, 127
——, A Correction 311
Carter, A. L., Nietzsche on the Art of Writing 98
Catilina, Ibsen's 329
Cawley, R. R., "Areytos" in Sidney's *Defence of Poesy* ... 121
Cellini, Benvenuto, and Anatole France 188
Celtic Revival in English Literature 125
César Birotteau, Balzac's 414
Chanson de Roland 166
Chatterton, Thomas, New Poem by — 226
——'s, Thomas, *Epistle to the Reverend Mr. Catcott* 336
Chaucer and Venantius Fortunatus 376
—— as a Literary Critic 255
Chaytor, H. J., The Troubadours and England 318
Chinard, G., Volney et l'Amérique 499
——: P. de Bacourt and J. W. Cunliffe, French Literature during the Last Half-Century 305
——: A. Schinz, Eighteenth Century Readings 363
Chronology of Lope de Vega's *Comedias* 268
Church, H. W., Bordeaux, *La Peur de Vivre* 109

PAGE

Churchill, G. B., *The Country Wife* and *The Plain-Dealer*, by W. Wycherley 445
Clark, H. H., A Study of Melancholy in Edward Young .. 129, 193
Clough, B. G.: J. Beresford, The Poems of Charles Cotton, 241
Cohn, E., Gesellschaftsideale und Gesellschaftsroman 128
Coleridge, Paragraph Deleted by — 58
Comédie de mœurs 444
Cook, A. S., *Beowulf* 1422 77
——, Chaucer and Venantius Fortunatus 376
Correction, A 311
Cotton's, Charles, Poems 241
Country Wife, Wycherley's 445
Cowper, F. A. G., Italian Folk Tales and Folk Songs 126
Crane, R. S.: C. B. Tinker, Nature's Simple Plan 291
Crane, T. F.: J. Bolte, Johannes Pauli's *Schimpf und Ernst* 314
——: F. A. G. Cowper, Italian Folk Tales and Folk Songs .. 126
Crawford, A. W., The Apparitions in *Macbeth* 345, 383
Criticism, Literary 460
Crosland, J., *Guibert d'Adrenas*, 190
Cunliffe, J. W., P. de Bacourt and —, French Literature during the Last Half-Century 305
Curme, G. O., A Grammar of the German Language 425
Cynewulf 397
Cyrano de Bergerac, Notes on . 96

Dale, G. J., An Unpublished Version of the *Historia de Abindarráez y Jarifa* 31
Daniels, W. M., Contes de la France Contemporaine 110
Dante and Statius 120
——, Bodmer and — 247
—— Notes 338
——'s *Paradiso* 309
Dargan, E. P., W. A. Nitze and —, A History of French Literature 35
Date, new, for George Wilkins's *Three Miseries of Barbary* ... 285
Davedet, Davoudet, Davoudel .. 410
Defence of Poesy, Sidney's 121

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

PAGE

Defoe's *Robinson Crusoe* 235
Democracy, Novel of — 178
De Perott, J., *The Mirror of Knighthood* 441
Deutsche Literaturwerke 212
Dialectologie romane 357
Diderot's Earliest Publication. 504
Dimnet, E., French Grammar made Clear 107
Dodsley's, Robert, *The King and the Miller of Mansfield* 394
Drama, Tragic 455
Dryden's Prologue to the *Prophetess* 123
——'s Zimri 251
Du Bellay's *Regrets* 216
Du Breuil, A. J., The Novel of Democracy in America 178
Dubrule, N., Bazin's *Une Tache d'Encre* 109
Dutch Source for *Robinson Crusoe* 235
—— Theater 364
Dynasts, Hardy's 455

Ebers, F., P. Friedrich und —, Das Grabbe-Buch 175
Edward II, Marlowe's 437
Eighteenth Century Humanism, 191
—— —— Readings 363
England, Racial Mixture in Northern — 203
——, Troubadours and — 318
English Literature 125
Epic, Old French 180
Epistle to the Reverend Mr. Catcott, Chatterton's 336
Erckmann-Chatrian, *Histoire d'un Conscrit de 1813* 110
Ermatinger, E., Wieland und die Schweiz 508
Etymologisches Wörterbuch, Kluge's 350
Evans, G. F., An Overlooked Sonnet 184
Evolution of Arthurian Romance 482
Examiner, Shelley's Reviews Written for the — 118

Fahrwohl! 399
Fairy, Sylvestre Bonnard's —, 380
Fates, Old Norse 466
Faust, Goethe's 428
Faust, A. B.: K. Francke, Die Kulturwerte der Deutschen Literatur 103

PAGE

Fess, G. M., Meléndes Valdés' *Vanidad de las Quejas del Hombre contra su Hacedor* and the *Pensées* of Pascal... 282
Festschrift für Ph. A. Becker, 367
Fichter, W. L., Notes on the Chronology of Lope de Vega's *Comedias* 268
First Draft of Swinburne's *Hertha* 22
First French Sonnets 475
Flom, G. T., Place-Name Tests of Racial Mixture in Northern England 203
——: O. Skulerud, Telemaalet i Umriss 111
Foerster, N., and J. M. Steadman, Sentences and Thinking, 252
Folk Tales and Folk Songs, Italian 126
Fontenelle, Bodmer and — 437
——'s Poems 249
Forgotten Sonnet of Lope de Vega 440
France, Anatole 188, 380
Francke, K., Die Kulturwerte der Deutschen Literatur 103
——: W. Silz, Heinrich von Kleist's Conception of the Tragic 494
Frank, G.: H. J. Chaytor, The Troubadours and England... 318
——: J. Melander, *Guibert d'Adrenas;* J. Crosland, *Guibert d'Adrenas* 190
——: C. F. Ward, *Le Livre de la déablerie*. By Eloy D'Amerval 173
French, J. C.: N. Foerster and J. M. Steadman, Sentences and Thinking 252
French Actresses 297
—— Literature 35, 305, 316
—— Mystery Plays 276
—— Sonnets 475
—— Source of Bodmer 434
—— Text Books 106
—— Theatre 444
—— Tragedy 364
Freytag's *Soll und Haben* 10
Friedrich, P., und F. Ebers, Das Grabbe-Buch 175

Gauss, C.: W. A. Nitze and E. P. Dargan, A History of French Literature 35
Genesis, Heliand und — 50

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

PAGE

Genius as an Allegorical Figure, 89
German Grammar ... 425
—— Language ... 350
—— Literature ... 103, 301
Gesellschaftsideale und Gesellschaftsroman ... 128
Gilli, C.: G. Millardet, Linguistique et Dialectologie romanes ... 357
Gillet, J. E., A Forgotten Sonnet of Lope de Vega ... 440
Goddard, E. R., Bovée's Première Année de Français. A Reply ... 507
Goethe's *Faust* ... 428
——'s *Iphigenie auf Tauris* ... 329
——'s Political Interests prior to 1787 ... 496
Good Drink makes Good Blood. 153
Grabbe-Buch, Das ... 175
Grammar, German ... 425
Gray, R. P., Songs and Ballads of the Maine Lumberjacks ... 510
Greene, S. G., A new Date for George Wilkins's *Three Miseries of Barbary* ... 285
Greene's *Orlando Furioso* ... 54
Grimald's Translations from Beza ... 388
Guibert d'Adrenas ... 190

Hagen, S. N., ON. *Nornir* 'Fates' ... 466
Handful of Pleasant Delights .. 254
Hardy's *Dynasts* as Tragic Drama ... 455
Haskins, C. H., The Rise of Universities ... 381
Hastings, W. S., An unpublished Correspondence of Honoré de Balzac ... 65
——: H. Rickel, The Wisdom of Balzac ... 446
Hauptfragen der Romanistik .. 367
Havens, G. R.: G. Chinard, Volney et l'Amérique ... 499
Haxo, H. E.: G. Moldenhauer, Herzog Naimes im altfranzösischen Epos ... 180
Hebbel, Ibsen and the Analytic Exposition ... 127
Heliand und Genesis ... 50
Helmbrecht, 1251 ... 372
Hertha, Swinburne's ... 22
Herzog Naimes im altfranzösischen Epos ... 180

PAGE

Heywood's *If You Know Not Me, You Know Nobody* ... 220
Histoire Comique . . . de la Lune, Cyrano de Bergerac's — ... 96
Historia de Abindarráez y Jarifa ... 31
Holmes, U. T.: L. Thuasne, Oeuvres de François Villon; F. Neri, Le Poesie de François Villon ... 430
Houston, P. H., Doctor Johnson, a Study in Eighteenth Century Humanism ... 191
Hubbard, L. L., A Dutch Source for *Robinson Crusoe* ... 235
Hudson, H. H., Grimald's Translations from Beza ... 388
Humanism, Eighteenth Century — ... 191
Hungerpastor, Raabe's ... 10

Ibershoff, C. H., Another French Source of Bodmer ... 434
——, Bodmer Indebted to Dante, 247
Ibsen, Hebbel and ... 127
——'s *Catilina* and Goethe's *Iphigenie auf Tauris* ... 329
If You Know Not Me, You Know Nobody, Heywood's ... 220
Iphigenie auf Tauris, Goethe's. 329
Italian Folk Tales and Folk Songs ... 126

Jefferson and Volney ... 499
Jester, Shakespeare's ... 447
Jew's Daughter, The, and the Myth of Zagreus ... 161
Johnson, Doctor — and 'Mur'. 82
————, a Study in Eighteenth Century Humanism .. 191
Joubert, Joseph ... 53

Kaye, F. B., La Rochefoucauld and the Character of Zimri .. 251
——, Mandeville on the Origin of Language ... 136
Kaufman, P., The Touchstone Method of Judging Poetry ... 124
Keats, Shelley, and Mrs. Radcliffe ... 251
Kelso, Ruth, Saviolo and his *Practise* ... 33
King Aun in the Rök Inscription ... 223

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

PAGE

King, The, and the Miller of Mansfield, Dodsley's —..... 394
Kleist, H. v., A Wieland Quotation by —............... 442
——'s Conception of the Tragic, 494
Kluge, F., Etymologisches Wörterbuch der deutschen Sprache 350
Knowlton, E. C., Genius as an Allegorical Figure.......... 89
Krappe, A. H., A Byzantine Source of Shakespeare's *Othello* 156
Kuhl, E. P.: R. P. Gray, Songs and Ballads of the Maine Lumberjacks 510
——: C. H. Haskins, The Rise of Universities............. 381
——: H. E. Rollins, *A Handful of Pleasant Delights*........ 254
——: J. S. Smart, The Sonnets of John Milton............. 45
Kulturwerte der Deutschen Literatur 103
Kurrelmeyer, W.: E. Ermatinger, Wieland und die Schweiz 508
——: F. Kluge, Etymologisches Wörterbuch der deutschen Sprache 350
——: Schriften der Kleist-Gesellschaft, Bd. 2.......... 382
Kurtz, B. P., The Prose of Occleve's *Lerne to Dye*...... 56

Lacour, L., Les premières actrices françaises............ 297
'Lake' in Marlowe's *Edward II* 437
La Rochefoucauld and the Character of Zimri.......... 251
Lancaster, H. C.: L. Allard, La Comédie de mœurs en France au dix-neuvième siècle; N. C. Arvin, Eugène Scribe and the French Theatre..... 444
——: J. Bauwens, La Tragédie française et le théâtre hollandais au dix-septième siècle, 364
——: L. Lacour, Les premières actrices françaises.......... 297
——: G. Rudler, Les techniques de la critique et de l'histoire littéraires en littérature française moderne........... 316
Language, German............ 350
Language, Origin of........... 136
Lehman, B. H., A Paragraph Deleted by Coleridge........ 58

PAGE

Lerne to Dye, Occleve's........ 56
Lessing, O. E., Geschichte der deutschen Literatur......... 301
Levin, L. M., A Note on *Raoul de Cambrai*................ 470
Lindeman, J. M., Note on *Cynewulf* 397
Linguistique romane.......... 357
Literary Criticism............ 460
Literature, English........... 125
——, French..........35, 305, 316
——, German 103, 301
——, Spanish 487
Litz, F. A., Father Tabb: A Study of his Life and Works, 361
Livingston, C. H., Old French: *Davedet, Davoudet, Davoudel*, 410
Livre de la déablerie, by Eloy D'Amerval 173
Loomis, R. S., Bleheris and the Tristram Story............. 319
Lope de Vega, Sonnet of —.... 440
——'s *Comedias*............... 268
——'s *El Vellocino de Oro* in relation to its Sources...... 142
Lumberjacks, Maine —........ 510
Lundeberg, O. K., The True Sources of Robert Dodsley's *The King and the Miller of Mansfield* 394
Luria and Chankin, *Lectures Elémentaires* 110
Lyrics, Religious............. 419

Mabbott, T. O., A New Poem by Thomas Chatterton......... 226
Macbeth, Shakespeare's........ 245, 345, 383
McCutcheon, R. P., Dryden's Prologue to the *Prophetess*,.. 123
McKillop, A. D., Some Details of the Sonnet Revival...... 438
Maine Lumberjacks........... 510
Malone, K., King Aun in the Rök Inscription............ 223
——, Notes on the *Writing Scholar's Companion* (1695), 502
Mandeville on the Origin of Language 136
Marlowe's *Edward II*......... 437
Martin, H. M., Lope de Vega's *El Vellocino de Oro* in relation to its Sources.......... 142
Martin, R. G., The Sources of Heywood's *If You Know Not Me, You Know Nobody*, Part I 220

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

PAGE

Maupassant's *Bel Ami* 185
Maynadier, G. H.: J. D. Bruce, The Evolution of Arthurian Romance 482
Meaning of the Word 'Lake' in Marlowe's *Edward II* 437
Melancholy in Edward Young .. 129, 193
Melander, J.: *Guibert d'Adrenas* 190
Millardet, G., Linguistique et Dialectologie romanes 357
Milton's Sonnets 45
Minde-Pouet, G., u. J. Petersen, Schriften der Kleist-Gesellschaft 382
Mirror of Knighthood 441
Moldenhauer, G., Herzog Naimes im altfranzösischen Epos 180
Morris, G. D., Zola's *L'Attaque du Moulin* 109
Morris, M., A Note on Wordsworth and Vaughan 187
Much Ado, Shakespeare's 447
Müller, O.: Hauptfragen der Romanistik. Festschrift für Ph. A. Becker 367
'Mur,' Doctor Johnson and —, 82
Mustard, W. P., Dante and Statius 120
Mystery Plays, French 276
Myth of Zagreus 161

Naimes, Herzog 180
Nature's Simple Plan 291
Neri, F., Le Poesie de François Villon 430
Nethercot, A. H.: L. L. Hubbard, A Dutch Source for *Robinson Crusoe* 235
Neudrucke Deutscher Literaturwerke 212
New Poem by Thomas Chatterton 226
Nietzsche on the Art of Writing 98
Nitze, W. A., The Sources of the Ninth Sonnet of *Les Regrets*, 216
——, and E. P. Dargan, A History of French Literature ... 35
Nornir, Old Norse 466
Northup, C. S.: A. J. Du Breuil, The Novel of Democracy in America 178
Note on *Cynewulf* 397
—— on *Raoul de Cambrai* 470
—— on Wordsworth and Vaughan 187

PAGE

Notes, Dante — 338
—— on Cyrano de Bergerac ... 96
—— on Performances of French Mystery Plays 276
—— on the Chronology of Lope de Vega's *Comedias* 268
—— on the *Writing Scholar's Companion* 502
—— on Voltaire 1, 479
—— to a Note 309
Novel of Democracy in America 178

Occleve's *Lerne to Dye* 56
Old French *Davedet, Davoudet, Davoudel* 410
—— —— Epic 180
Old Norse *Nornir* 'Fates' 466
—— —— *Sko* 378
Origin of Language 136
—— of the Shelley Society 312
Orlando Furioso, Greene's 54
Othello, Shakespeare's 156
Overlooked Sonnet 184

Paradiso, Dante's 309
Paragraph Deleted by Coleridge 58
Parry, J. J., An Arthurian Parallel 307
Pascal's *Pensées* 282
Pauli's, J., *Schimpf und Ernst*, 314
Peck, W. E., Keats, Shelley, and Mrs. Radcliffe 251
——, On the Origin of the Shelley Society (Postscript), 312
——, Shelley's Reviews Written for the *Examiner* 118
Pensée, La, et la Langue 229
Pensées, Pascal's 282
Petersen, J., G. Minde-Pouet und —, Schriften der Kleist-Gesellschaft 382
Petsch, R., Goethe's *Faust* 428
Pfandl, L., Spanische Literaturgeschichte 487
Pierce, F. E., Blake and Seventeenth Century Authors 150
Place-Name Tests of Racial Mixture in Northern England 203
Plain-Dealer, Wycherley's 445
Poems by Fontenelle 249
—— of Charles Cotton 241
Poetry, Judging of 124
Political Interests, Goethe's ... 496

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

PAGE

Potter, G. R., Thomas Chatterton's *Epistle to the Reverend Mr. Catcott* 336
Practise, Saviolo's 33
Price, L. M., J. E. Schlegel's *Die stumme Schönheit* 509
Propheteas, Prologue to the—.. 123
Prose of Occleve's *Lerne to Dye*, 56

Raabe's *Der Hungerpastor* 10
Racial Mixture in Northern England 203
Radcliffe, Mrs., Keats, Shelley, and — 251
Raoul de Cambrai 470
Ratchford, Fannie E., The First Draft of Swinburne's *Hertha*, 22
Regrets, Du Bellay's 216
Reinsch, F. H., Goethe's Political Interests prior to 1787.. 496
Religious Lyrics 419
Reviews, Shelley's 118
Revival, Celtic, in English Literature 125
——, Sonnet — 438
Rickel, H., The Wisdom of Balzac 446
Rise of Universities 381
Robinson Crusoe 235
Rök Inscription 223
Rollins, H. E., *A Handful of Pleasant Delights* 254
Romance, Arthurian 482
Romance Dialectology 357
—— Linguistics 357
—— Philology 367
Roulston, R. B.: E. Cohn, Gesellschaftsideale und Gesellschaftsroman 128
Rudler, G., Les techniques de la critique et de l'histoire littéraires en littérature française moderne 316

Saviolo and his *Practise* 33
Schevill, R.: L. Pfandl, Spanische Literaturgeschichte 487
Schimpf und Ernst 314
Schinz, A.: F. Brunot, La Pensée et la Langue 229
——, Eighteenth Century Readings 363
Schlegel's, J. E., *Die stumme Schönheit* 509
Schriften der Kleist-Gesellschaft 382

PAGE

Scribe, Eugène, and the French Theatre 444
Sehrt, E. H.: O. Behaghel, *Heliand und Genesis* 50
Sentences and Thinking 252
Seuffert, B.: R. Petsch, Goethe's *Faust* 428
Seventeenth Century Authors.. 142
Shackford, M. H., Shakespeare and Greene's *Orlando Furioso*, 54
Shakespeare and Greene's *Orlando Furioso* 54
——'s Jester: the Dates of *Much Ado* and *As You Like It* 447
——'s *Macbeth* 245, 345, 383
——'s *Othello* 156
Shelley, Keats, —, and Mrs. Radcliffe 251
——, Sidelight on — 121
—— Society 18, 312
——'s Reviews Written for the *Examiner* 118
Sidney's *Defence of Poesy* 121
Sidelight on Shelley 121
Silz, W., Freytag's *Soll und Haben* and Raabe's *Der Hungerpastor* 10
——, Heinrich von Kleist's Conception of the Tragic 494
Sjouke Gabbes 235
Sko, Old Norse 378
Skulerud, O., Telemaalet i Umriss 111
Smart, J. C., The Sonnets of John Milton 45
Smeeks, Hendrik 235
Smith, H. E.: A. Beaunier, Joseph Joubert, Lettres à Mme de Vintimille 53
Snyder, E. D., The Celtic Revival in English Literature.. 125
Sociological Aspects of Literary Criticism 460
Soll und Haben, Freytag's 10
Song in *The Beggar's Bush* 379
Songs and Ballads 510
Sonnet, An Overlooked — 184
——, Ninth, of *Les Regrets* 216
—— of Lope de Vega 440
Sonnet Revival 438
Sonnets, French 475
—— of John Milton 45
Source of Anatole France: Benvenuto Cellini 188

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

PAGE

Sources of Heywood's *If You Know Not Me, You Know Nobody* 220
—— of Robert Dodsley's *The King and the Miller of Mansfield* 394
—— of the Ninth Sonnet of *Les Regrets* 216
Spanish Literature 487
—— *Romance,* Is the — Quaternary? 443
Statius, Dante and 120
Stathers, M., Erckmann-Chatrian's *Histoire d'un Conscrit de 1813* 110
Steadman, J. M., N. Foerster and —, Sentences and Thinking 252
Stenberg, T. T., Ibsen's *Catilina* and Goethe's *Iphigenie auf Tauris* 329
Storer, W. H., Notes on Cyrano de Bergerac: A Mythical Translation of the *Histoire Comique . . . de la Lune* 96
Study of Melancholy in Edward Young 129, 193
Stumme Schönheit, J. E. Schlegel's 509
Sturtevant, A. M., Old Norse *Sko* 378
Swedelius, B. F., Is the Spanish *Romance* Always Quaternary —? 443
Swinburne's *Hertha* 22
Switzerland, Wieland and —.. 508
Sylvestre Bonnard's Fairy Again 380

Tabb, Father 361
Taylor, P., Birnam Wood: 700 A. D.—1600 A. D 244
Telemaalet i Umriss 111
Texel, Heinrich 235
Text Books, French 106
Theatre, Dutch 364
——, French 444
Three Francis Beaumonts 505
Three Miseries of Barbary 285
Thuasne, L., Oeuvres de François Villon 430
Tilley, M. P., Good Drink makes Good Blood 153
Tinker, C. B., Nature's Simple Plan 291
Touchstone Method of Judging Poetry 124

PAGE

Tracy, T. F., A Source of Anatole France: Benvenuto Cellini 188
Tragédie française 364
Tragic, H. v. Kleist's Conception of the — 494
Tragic Drama 455
Translations 388
Tristram Story 319
Troubadours and England 318
Tupper, J. W.: G. B. Churchill, *The Country Wife* and *The Plain-Dealer,* by W. Wycherley 445
——: P. H. Houston, Doctor Johnson, a Study in Eighteenth Century Humanism.. 191
——: E. D. Snyder, The Celtic Revival in English Literature 125

Uncollected Poems by Fontenelle 249
Universities, Rise of 381
Unpublished Correspondence of Honoré de Balzac 65
—— Version of the *Historia de Abindarráez y Jarifa* 31

Valdes', Meléndez, *Vanidad de las Quejas del Hombre contra su Hacedor* 276
Van Roosbroeck, G. L., Diderot's Earliest Publication... 504
——, Notes on Voltaire 1
——, Uncollected Poems by Fontenelle 249
Vaughan, Wordsworth and —.. 187
Vellocino de Oro, Lope de Vega's 142
Venantius Fortunatus 376
Villon, François, Poesie 430
——, Oeuvres 430
Vintimille, Mme de 53
Volney et l'Amérique 499
Voltaire, Notes on — 1, 479
Vos, B. J.: L. M. Price, J. E. Schlegel's *Die stumme Schönheit* 509

Walker, A. S., A Sidelight on Shelley 121
Walz, J. A., Fahrwohl! 399
Walter, Madame, Bel Ami and — 185
Ward, C. F., *Le Livre de la déablerie.* By Eloy D'Amerval 173

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

PAGE

Watson, M. W., French Short Stories of Today........... 110
Watts, G. B., Notes on Voltaire, 479
Wells, W. H., Chaucer as a Literary Critic............. 255
White, N. I., The Shelley Society Again................ 18
Whitmore, C. E., Mr. Hardy's *Dynasts* as Tragic Drama... 455
Wieland und die Schweiz...... 508
—— Quotation by H. v. Kleist, 442
Wilkins's, George, *Three Miseries of Barbary*............ 285
Williams, R. C.: Recent French Text Books................ 106
Wisdom of Balzac............ 446
Woodbridge, B. M., Bel Ami and Madame Walter........ 185
——, Sylvestre Bonnard's Fairy Again 380
Wordsworth and Vaughan..... 187
——'s Doctrine and Art....... 59
Worthington, H. S., The Beethoven Symphony in Balzac's *César Birotteau*............ 414

PAGE

Writing, Art of —............ 98
Writing Scholar's Companion.. 502
Wycherley, W., *The Country Wife* and *The Plain-Dealer*.. 445

Young, Edward, Melancholy in — 129, 193
Young, K.: C. Brown, Religious Lyrics of the XIVth Century, 419

Zagreus, Myth of............ 161
Zeydel, E. H.: P. Friedrich und F. Ebers, Das Grabbe-Buch.. 175
——: O. E. Lessing, Geschichte der deutschen Literatur..... 301
——: F. H. Reinsch, Goethe's Political Interests prior to 1787 496
——, Some Sociological Aspects of Literary Criticism.. 460
Zimri, Character of........... 251
Zola, *L'Attaque du Moulin*.... 109
Zwierzina, K.: G. O. Curme, A Grammar of the German Language 425

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

Digitized by Google

Original from
UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

RECENT PUBLICATIONS

ENGLISH

Adams, Joseph Q.—Chief Pre-Shakespearean Dramas. A Selection of Plays illustrating the history of the English Drama from its origin down to Shakespeare. *Boston:* Houghton Mifflin Co. [1924]. 712 pp. $3.75.

Aronstein, Philipp.—Englische Stilistik. *Leipzig:* Teubner, 1924. M. 4.60.

Attenborough, F. L.—The Laws of the Earliest English Kings. Edited and Translated. *Cambridge:* University Press, 1924. 256 pp.

Ayres, Howe, and Padelford, F. M.—The Modern Student's Book of English Literature. *New York:* Charles Scribner's Sons, 1924.

Baak, Frida.—Das poetische Bild bei Edmund Waller. Dissertation. *Münster:* 1924.

Baak, Hans. — Untersuchung der Aussprache von Edmund Waller (1606-1687) auf Grund seiner Reime. Dissertation. *Münster:* 1924.

Boutet de Nouvel, Roger. — La Vie de Lord Byron. *Paris:* Plon, 1924. Fr. 12.

Brandes, Georg. — William Shakespeare. *New York:* The Macmillan Company, 1924. $3.50.

Bullen, A. H. — Elizabethans. *London:* Chapman and Hall, 1924. 10s. 6d.

Cassidy, James.—A Study of Browning's "The Ring and the Book." *Oxford:* Blackwell, 1924.

Cody, Sherwin. — Poe: Man, Poet, and Creative Thinker. *New York:* Boni and Liveright, 1924. $2.00.

Dickinson, Thomas H.—Playwrights of the New American Theatre. *New York:* The Macmillan Co., 1924.

Dottin, Paul.—Daniel De Foe et ses romans. 3 vols. *Paris:* Les Presses Universitaires, 1924.

Ebert, W. — Vergleich der beiden Versionen von Lord Berners' Huon of Burdeux. Dissertation. *Halle:* 1924. 92 pp.

Ege, Karl.—Shakespeare's Anteil an Henry VIII. Dissertation. *Münster:* 1924. 23 pp.

Franz, W. — Shakespeare-Grammatik. Third Edition. *Heidelberg:* Carl Winter, 1924. 640 pp. M. 14.50.

French, John C.—Writing. *New York:* Harcourt, Brace and Co., 1924. 385 pp.

Friedrich, Karl.—Die englische Dramatisierung des Katilinastoffes. Dissertation. *Erlangen:* 1924.

Galland, René. — George Meredith and British Criticism, 1851-1909. *Paris:* Les Presses Universitaires, 1924. 120 pp.

—— George Meredith. Les cinquante premières années (1828-1878). *Paris:* Les Presses Universitaires, 1924. 430 pp. Fr. 30.

Gingerich, S. F.—The Growth of the Spirit in the Romantic Poets. *New York:* The Macmillan Co., 1924.

Hamilton, Clayton. — Conversations on Contemporary Drama. *New York:* The Macmillan Co., 1924.

Holt, Guy.—A Bibliography of the Writings of James Branch Cabell. *Philadelphia:* The Centaur Book Shop, 1924.

Ker, W. P.—Essays and Studies by Members of the British Association. Volume IX. *Oxford:* The University Press. *New York:* Oxford University Press, 1924. 144 pp. $2.50.

Kylie, Edward.—The English Correspondence of Saint Boniface. *New York:* Oxford University Press. 1924. $1.85.

Matthews, Brander, and Paul R. Lieder. —The Chief British Dramatists excluding Shakespeare. Twenty-five Plays from the middle of the Fifteenth Century to the end of the Nineteenth. *Boston:* Houghton Mifflin Co. [1924]. xviii + 1084 pp. $4.00.

Morgan, A. E. — Tendencies of Modern English Drama. *London:* Constable, 1924. 320 pp. 10s. 6d.

Morley, Christopher. — Modern Essays. *New York:* Harcourt, Brace and Co., 1924.

Nicoll, Sir William Robertson.—Dickens's Own Story. *New York:* The Frederick A. Stokes Co., 1924.

Pence, R. W. — Essays by Present-Day Writers. *New York:* The Macmillan Co., 1924. $2.00.

Prior, O. H. — Cambridge Anglo-Norman Texts. *Cambridge:* The University Press, 1924.

Spender, Harold.—Byron and Greece. *New York:* Charles Scribner's Sons, 1924. $4.00.

Steele, Robert. — Mediæval Lore from Bartholomew Anglicus. *New York:* Oxford Univ. Press, 1924.

Sweet, Henry.—A Short Historical English Grammar (Corrected Impression). *New York:* Oxford University Press, 1924. $1.50.

Tietjens, Eugenie.—Englische Zahlwörter des 15./16. Jahrh. Formelles, Syntaktisches, Stilistisches. Dissertation. *Greifswald:* 1924.

Westendorpf, Karl.—Das Prinzip der Verwendung des Slang bei Dickens. Mit Slang-Argot Bibliographie. Dissertation. *Greifswald:* 1924.

Wyld, Henry Cecil.—Studies in English Rhymes from Surrey to Pope. *New York:* E. P. Dutton and Co., 1924. $2.50.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

GERMAN

Borkowsky, Ernst.—Goethes u. Schillers Lyrik. [Führer zur deutschen Dichtung. H. 3]. *Breslau:* Ferd. Hirt, 1923. 128 pp. M. 3.40.

Brandes, Georg. — Hauptströmungen der Lit. d. 19. Jhdts. Vom Verf. neu bearb. endgültige Ausg. übers. v. Richard Eckert. Bd. I. (I, 1. Die Emigrantenliteratur. 2. Die romantische Schule in Deutschland). *Berlin:* E. Reiss, 1924. viii + 420 pp. Cloth, M. 10.

Frings, Theod. — Rheinische Sprachgeschichte. Überblicke. Mit 1 Karte von Dr. Martin [S.-A. aus Gesch. d. Rheinlandes von den ältesten Zeiten bis zur Gegenwart. 1922.] *Essen:* G. D. Baedeker, 1924. 54 pp. M. 2.50.

Geyer, Wilm.—Fritz von Unruh. Versuch einer Deutung. [Deutsche Zukunft, H. 4.] *Rudolstadt:* Greifenverlag, 1924. 37 pp. 80 Pf.

Greiner, Wilh.—Fritz Reuters Eisenacher Zeit. Mit 6 Abb. *Eisenach:* O. Kayser, 1924. iii + 76 pp. M. 1.50.

Gundolf, Friedrich.—Martin Opitz. *München:* Duncker & Humblot, 1923. 52 pp. M. 1.20.

Heise, Wilhelm. — Gerhart Hauptmann. Einsame Menschen. Florian Geyer. Der weisse Heiland. [Das Drama der Gegenwart. 3 = Reclams Universal-Bibl. 6479]. *Leipzig:* Reclam [1924]. 78 pp. 30 Pf.

Holl, K.—Die Geschichte des Wortes Beruf. [S.-A. aus Sitzungsber. d. Preuss. Akad. d. Wiss., Phil.-hist. Kl.]. *Berlin:* de Gruyter & Co., 1924. 29 pp. 4°. M. 0.60.

Lessing, G. E.—Gespräche nebst sonstigen Zeugnissen aus seinem Umgang. Zum erstenmal ges. u. hrsg. v. F. Frh. v. Biedermann. *Berlin:* Propyläen-Verlag, 1924. vii + 437 pp. Bound M. 8.50.

Liptzin, Solomon. — Shelley in Germany. *New York:* Columbia Univ. Press, 1924. 97 pp. $1.50.

List, Friedr.—Friederike Brion. Ein Beitrag zu Goethes elsäss. Schuld u. zur Psychologie s. Liebe. 2. Aufl. *Giessen:* Ferber, 1923. 31 pp.

Muthesius, Karl.—Goethe und seine Mutter. *Dresden:* Reissner, 1923. 207 pp., bound, M. 4.

Rahn, Dietrich.—Die Orts- und Flurnamen des Stadt- und Landkreises Greifswald. [Diss.]. *Greifswald:* J. Abel, 1923. iv + 227 pp.

Rehm, Walther.—Das Werden des Renaissancebildes in der deutschen Dichtung vom Rationalismus bis zum Realismus. *München:* C. H. Beck, 1924. vii + 192 pp. M. 5.

Storm, Gertrud.—Wie mein Vater Immensee erlebte. Mit d. Novelle u. e. Lebensbilde d. Dichters. *Wien:* Hölder-Pichler-Tempsky, 1924. 114 pp. M. 1.60.

Schneider, Heinr. — Lessing u. Wolfenbüttel. *Wolfenbüttel:* J. Zwiszler, 1924. 56 pp. M. 2.

Seip, Elsbeth.—Die gotischen Verba mit dem Präfix *and-*. [Giessener Beiträge 10.] *Giessen:* von Münchow, 1923. 24 pp. Teildruck. M. 1.25.

Trömel, Paul.—Schiller-Bibliothek. (Verz. derjenigen Drucke, welche d. Grundlage d. Textes d. Schiller'schen Werke bilden. Aus d. Nachlass von Paul Trömel. Vorw.: H. Brockhaus.) Unveränd. Abdr. d. Aufl. von 1865. *Leipzig:* Schwarzenberg & Schumann, 1924. xiii + 97 pp. M. 6.

Wasserzieher, Ernst. — Hans und Grete. 1000 Vornamen erklärt. 2., verb. u. stark verm. Aufl. *Berlin:* Dümmler, 1924. 47 pp. 80 Pf.

Wiessner, Hermann. — Der Stabreimvers in Richard Wagners "Ring des Nibelungen." [Germ. Studien, H. 30]. *Berlin:* Ebering, 1924. 109 pp. M. 3.60.

FRENCH

Bossuet.—Correspondance, publ. par Urbain et Levesque. T. 14 et suppl. *Paris:* Hachette, 1923. 536 pp. Fr. 30.

Bracq, Jean Charlemagne.—The Evolution of French Canada. *New York:* Macmillan, 1924. viii + 467 pp.

Brown, Irving:—Leconte de Lisle. *New York:* Columbia Univ. Press, 1924. 283 pp. $2.50.

Chappell, A. F.—The Enigma of Rabelais. *London:* Cambridge University Press, 1924. xvi + 196 pp.

Chartier, Alain.—Le Quadrilogue invectif, éd. par E. Droz. *Paris:* Champion, 1923. xi + 75 pp. Fr. 4.

Chénier, A.—Œuvres poétiques. Av.-propos de L. Barthou. *Paris:* Amis des livres, 1924. 2 vols. xi + 270 and 293 pp.

Chinard, Gilbert. — Les Amitiés Américaines de Madame d'Houdetot. *Paris:* Champion, 1924. 62 pp. (Bibliothèque de Littérature Comparée, Vol. VIII.)

Commynes, Philippe de.—Mémoires édités par Joseph Calmette. *Paris:* Champion, 1924. xxxv + 257 pp. (Classiques de l'Histoire de France au Moyen Age.)

Curel, F. de.—La nouvelle idole, ed. by H. A. Smith and L. R. Méras. *New York:* Century, 1924. 124 pp. 85 cts.

Dondo.—Pathelin et autres pièces. *Boston:* Heath, 1924. iv + 22 pp. $1.16.

Doré et Simonson. — Les Livres d'André Gide. *Abbeville:* Paillart, 1923. 92 pp.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

Du Bellay, J. — Œuvres poétiques. V. Recueils lyriques. Ed. par H. Chamard. *Paris:* Hachette, 1923. xiii + 416 pp. Fr. 20.

Grammont, M.—L'Assimilation. Notes de phonétique générale. *Paris:* Champion, 1923. 112 pp.

Lescale, P. — Recherches et observations sur le patois du Quercy. *Cahors:* Bergon, 1923. 173 pp. Fr. 6.

Louis XIV. — Mémoires pour les années 1661 et 1666 suivis des réflections sur le métier de roi etc., éd. par J. Longnon. *Paris:* Bossard, 1923. 258 pp.

Malgorn, M.—Dict. nautique fr., ang., ital. *Paris:* Ecole du génie civil, 1923. 328 pp.

Mallet, F. — Pierre Loti. *Paris:* -Nouv. Rev. critique, 1923. 59 pp. Fr. 3.75.

Malot, H. H.—Sans famille, ed. by R. and H. Fouré. *New York:* Merrill, 1924. 230 pp. 70 cts.

Mornet, D.—Hist. de la littérature et de la pensée françaises. *Paris:* Larousse, 1924. 256 pp. Fr. 7.50.

Murger, H.—Scènes de la vie de Bohème, ed. by J. Van Horne. *New York:* Century, 1924. 231 pp. $1.25.

Pargment, M. S. — Practical exercises in French Pronunciation. *New York:* Holt, 1924. ii + 39 pp.

Pascal, Blaise.—Œuvres complètes, publ. par F. Strowski. *Paris:* Ollendorff. x + c + 434 pp.

Patrick, G. Z. — Etude morphologique et syntaxique des verbes dans Maistre Pierre Pathelin. *Berkeley:* Univ. of Cal. Press, 1924. 90 cts.

Poincaré, R.—Ernest Renan. *Abbeville:* Paillart, 1923. 59 pp.

Roth, S.—Contes des provinces. *New York:* American Bk. Co., 1924. 312 pp. 88 cts.

Sandeau, J.—Mlle de la Seiglière, ed. by L. de Vries. *Boston:* Allyn & Bacon, 1924. 199 pp. 80 cts.

Saint-Simon. — Mémoires, éd. par A. de Boislisle. *Paris:* Hachette, 1923. 424 pp.

Smead, J. Van Ness.—Chateaubriand et la Bible. *Paris and Baltimore:* Les Presses Universitaires and Johns Hopkins Press, 1924. 166 pp. (Johns Hopkins Studies in Romance Literatures and Languages, Vol. II.)

Smith, Maxwell A.—A Short History of French Literature. *New York:* Holt, 1924. vii + 390 pp.

Studer et Evans. — Anglo-Norman Lapidaries. *Paris:* Champion, 1924. xx + 403 pp.

Varillon et Rambaud. — Enquête sur les maîtres de la jeune littérature suivie de lettres et de commentaires par Alibert, Barrès, Bourget, Boylesve, Gide, Henriot, Massis, Maurras, de Noailles. *Paris:* Bloud et Gay, 1923. 351 pp.

ITALIAN

Albertazzi, A.—Novelle italiane di ogni secolo. Scelta e commento storico critico di —. *Bologna:* N. Zanichelli, 1924. 2 vols., 174, 208 pp. L. 9.

Borgese, G. A.—La vita e il libro. Prima serie (I narratori, i poeti, i letterati, ombre della storia, la crisi della fede, i massimi problemi, le terre lontane). *Bologna:* N. Zanichelli, 1923. xii + 381 pp. L. 28.

Calabrò, G.—Arturi Regis ambages pulcerrime. *Messina:* Tip. "La Sicilia," 1924. 24 pp.

Carducci, Giosuè. — Prose (1859-1903). *Bologna:* N. Zanichelli, 1924. 1484 pp. L. 30.

Croce, B.—Conversazioni critiche. Seconda edizione riveduta. *Bari:* G. Laterza e figli, 1924. 2 vols., 357, 367 pp. L. 50. (Scritti di storia letteraria e politica, IX-X.)

D'Amato, A.—Studî sul Tasso e sul Manzoni. *Piacenza:* Soc. tip. ed. Porta, 1924. xiv + 333 pp. L. 10.

De Chiara, S.—Vincenzo Padula. Prefazione di Benedetto Croce. *Messina:* Casa ed. "La Sicilia," 1923. viii + 132 pp. L. 8. (Studi e ritratti calabresi: collezione del "Brutium," no. 2.)

Evangelisti, Anna.—Giosuè Carducci col suo maestro e col suo precursore. Saggi due. *Bologna:* L. Cappelli, 1924. xii + 327 pp. L. 18.

Fattorello, F.—I Promessi Sposi. Lezione tenuta il 20 marzo 1923. *Udine:* Libr. Carducci ed., 1923. 17 pp. L. 2.50. (Università popolare, Udine, no. 6.)

Ferri, F.—Un accademico delle scienze di Bologna e il poeta Basinio Parmense. *Città di Castello:* Soc. tip. Leonardo da Vinci, 1924. 47 pp.

Goldoni, Carlo.—Il ventaglio. Commedia in tre atti. *Bologna-Rocca S. Casciano:* L. Cappelli, 1923. 82 pp. L. 1.

—— La locandiera. Commedia di tre atti, in prosa, con introduzione e note di I. Sanesi. *Torino:* G. B. Paravia e C., 1924. xv + 115 pp. L. 4.75. (Biblioteca di classici italiani.)

Leopardi, Giacomo. — Operette morali e pensieri, con introduzione e commento di G. Agnoli. *Milano:* F. Vallardi, 1923. ii + 382 pp. L. 10. (Biblioteca di classici italiani annotati.)

Manzoni, Alessandro.—Le più belle pagine, scelte da Giovanni Papini. II. *Milano:* Fratelli Treves, 1924. xix + 290 pp. (Le più belle pagine degli scrittori italiani, scelte da scrittori viventi, no. 16.)

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

Nardi, P.—Scapigliatura. Da Giuseppe Rovani a Carlo Dossi. *Bologna:* N. Zanichelli, 1923. 336 pp. L. 17.50.

Pandolfini Barberi, A.—Burattini e burattinai bolognesi: con una commedia inedita di Augusto Galli e appendice di O. Trebbi. *Bologna:* N. Zanichelli, 1923. 184 pp. L. 12.50.

Prezzolini, G., e Delcroix, C.—Per una maggiore cultura italiana. *Firenze:* Vallecchi, 1924. 32 pp.

Ramírez de Villa-Urrutia, W.—Cortesanas italianas del Renacimiento. (La Bella Imperia. Tulia de Aragón. Verónica Franco.) Estudio histórico. *Madrid:* Tipografía Artística, 1924. 111 pp.

Ravenna, Lia. — La leggenda del Tasso. *Rovigo:* Industrie grafiche italiane, 1923. 103 pp.

Romagnoli, E.—L'antica madre. Studî su l'italianità della cultura. *Milano:* Soc. ed. Unitas, 1923. 185 pp. L. 10.

Sabbadini, R.—Giovanni da Ravenna insigne figura d'umanista (1343-1408), da documenti inediti. *Como:* Tip. ed. Ostinelli, di C. Nani e C., 1924. xii + 258 pp. L. 40. (Studî umanistici, no. 1.)

Tasso, Torquato.—Aminta. Edited by E. Grillo. *New York:* Dutton, 1924. 207 pp. $2.00.

Toffanin, G.—L'eredità del Rinascimento in Arcadia. *Bologna:* N. Zanichelli, 1923. vi + 310 pp. L. 24.

Ziliotto, B.—Storia letteraria di Trieste e dell' Istria. *Trieste:* La Editoriale libraria, 1924. ii + 99 pp. L. 4.50.

Zoncada, A.—La vita e l'opera di Eugenio Camerini. *Pavia:* Tip. Cooperativa, 1924. 43 pp.

SPANISH

Bañados, G. M.—Apuntes para un Diccionario Marítimo Militar Chileno. *Santiago de Chile:* Imp. Cervantes, 1924. 287 pp.

Boza Masvidal, A. A.—El problema de la originalidad de la literatura cubana. *Habana:* Imp. "La Propagandista," 1924. 25 pp.

Bravo Moreno, F.—Síntomas de la patología mental que se hallan en las obras literarias de don Benito Pérez Galdós. *Barcelona:* Impr. del Instituto mental de Santa Cruz, 1923. 54 pp.

Bruner y Prieto, F.—Los incunables ibéricos de la Bibliothèque Nationale de Paris. Epítome. *Palma de Mallorca:* F. Soler Prats, 1924. 60 pp.

Coester, A.—An Anthology of the Modernista Movement in Spanish America. Compiled and edited by —. *Boston:* Ginn and Company, 1924. xxxvii + 314 pp. $1.48.

García Fayos, J.—El Colegio de traductores de Toledo y Domingo Gundisalvo. *Madrid:* Impr. G. Hernández y Galo Sáez, 1920. 9 pp.

Gillet, J. E.—A Neglected Chapter in the History of the Spanish Romance. *New York:* 1922. 27 pp. (Repr. from the "Revue Hispanique," LVI.)

—— Apuntes sobre las obras dramáticas de Vasco Diaz Tanco de Fregenal. *Madrid:* Tip. de la "Revista de Archivos, Bibliotecas y Museos," 1923. 7 pp. (Repr. fr. the "Revista de Archivos, Bibliotecas y Museos.")

Hall, G. — All Spanish Method. Short Course. A natural and direct method for learning Spanish. *Yonkers-on-Hudson, N. Y.:* World Book Company, 1924. xii + 451 pp. $2.40. (New-World Spanish Series.)

Lemus y Rubio, P.—Ejercicios literarios de análisis y composición, ordenados y anotados por —. *Murcia:* Tip. de J. A. Jiménez, 1924. vii + 244 pp.

Llano Roza de Ampudia, A. de.—Vocabulario de la Tixileira, dialecto jergal asturiano recogido y compuesto por —. *Oviedo:* Impr. "La Cruz," 1924.

Matta Vial, E.—El Licenciado Pedro de Oña. Estudio biográfico crítico, por —. Con un prólogo de J. T. Medina. *Santiago de Chile:* Imp. Universitaria, 1924. x + 134 pp.

Nabot y Tomás, F.—Los cartularios de las Catedrales y Monasterios de España en la Edad Media. *Barcelona:* Imp. de Angel Ortega, 1924. 59 pp.

Peláez y Tapia, J.—Biografía del señor don Fernando Rioja de Medel, primer Conde de Rioja de Neila. *Valparaíso:* Imp. Victoria, 1923. 94 pp.

Pérez Escrich and De Las Viñas.—Fortuna and La golondrita, el gato y el mono. Edited by R. A. Bahret. *New York:* American Book Company, 1924. 159 pp. 92 cts.

Perier, J. L.—A Short History of Spanish Literature. *New York:* 1924. vii + 171 pp.

Saralegui y Medina, M. de.—Escarceos filológicos. II. *Madrid:* Imp. de los Hijos de M. G. Hernández, 1924. iv + 326 pp.

Tamayo y Baus, M. (Joaquín Estébanez).—Un drama nuevo. Drama en tres actos. Authorized edition. Edited, with an introduction, notes, and a vocabulary by J. D. Fitz-Gerald and J. M. Hill. *Boston:* B. H. Sanborn and Company, 1924. xxxix + 257 pp. (The Hispanic Series.)

Williams and Bonilla.—A shorter Spanish Course. *Chicago:* Scott, Foresman, 1924. 488 pp. $1.60.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

Digitized by Google
Original from
UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

Digitized by Google
Original from
UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

CHIEF BRITISH DRAMATISTS

Edited by

BRANDER MATTHEWS AND PAUL ROBERT LIEDER

This volume brings together twenty-five plays which adequately illustrate the development of English dramatic literature. The three early plays,—*Abraham and Isaac, The Second Shepherds' Play,* and *Ralph Roister Doister,* are followed by selected plays from Kyd, Marlowe, Jonson, Heywood, Beaumont and Fletcher, Webster, Massinger, Wycherley, Dryden, Otway, Vanbrugh, Congreve, Farquhar, Goldsmith, Sheridan, Bulwer-Lytton, Boucicault, Robertson, Gilbert, Wilde, Pinero, Henry Arthur Jones.

xviii + 1084 pages. $4.00.

OTHER VOLUMES IN THE CHIEF DRAMATISTS SERIES

CHIEF PRE-SHAKESPEAREAN DRAMAS *Edited by* Joseph Quincy Adams
CHIEF CONTEMPORARY DRAMATISTS, I. II. *Edited by* Thomas H. Dickinson
CHIEF EUROPEAN DRAMATISTS *Edited by* Brander Matthews
CHIEF ELIZABETHAN DRAMATISTS (Excluding Shakespeare)
Edited by William Allan Neilson

HOUGHTON MIFFLIN COMPANY

BOSTON NEW YORK CHICAGO SAN FRANCISCO

SMITH COLLEGE STUDIES IN MODERN LANGUAGES

Published Quarterly by the Departments of Modern Languages of Smith College

Vol. I. Nos. 1-4. **Les Doctrines Littéraires de la Quotidienne,** by Helen M. King.
Vol. II. No. 1. **An Unpublished Letter of William James,** by Mary A. Jordan.
Scott and Scandinavian Literature, by Paul R. Lieder.
Nos. 2-3. **Le Dernier Séjour de J.-J. Rousseau à Paris,** by Elizabeth A. Foster.
No. 4. **The Genesis of the Theory of "Art for Art's Sake" in Germany and in England,** by Rose F. Egan.
Vol. III. Nos. 1-2. **Knut Hamsun, His Personality and His Outlook upon Life,** by Josef Wiehr.
No. 3. **The Tradition of the Goddess Fortuna, in Roman Literature and in the Transitional Period,** by Howard R. Patch.
No. 4. **The Tradition of the Goddess Fortuna, in Medieval Philosophy and Literature,** by Howard R. Patch.
Vol. IV. No. 1. **The Knight of Curtesy,** edited by Elizabeth McCausland.
Nos. 2-3. **Les "Fastnachtspiele" de Hans Sachs,** by Hélène Cattanès.
No. 4. **Fortuna in Old French Literature,** by Howard R. Patch.
Vol. V. No. 1. **La Société des Bonnes-Lettres,** by Margaret Peoples.
Documents sur le Dadaisme, by Albert Schinz.
No. 2. **Lord Byron's British Reputation.—Wordsworth since 1916,** by Richard A. Rice.

Subscriptions and requests should be addressed to the Smith College Librarian, Northampton, Mass. Single copies, seventy-five cents; two dollars for the year.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

A COURSE IN SPANISH COMPOSITION

By FREDERICK W. WHITMAN,
Assistant Professor of Romance Languages,
Williams College, and

FRANCISCO AGUILERA,
Instructor in Spanish, Yale University

A complete course in Spanish Composition, combining the practical with the cultural, to be used when students have mastered the elements of Spanish grammar. It offers an interesting and unique introduction to the history, civilization, customs, culture, and literature of Spain and Latin America. Full vocabularies.

"I find it an excellent book and quite suited to our purposes. We expect to use it in our third year classes."—Prof. G. T. WILKINSON, *Ohio University.*

"It is very pleasing to me. I should like to use it in my second and third year classes. The material is valuable and fills a long-felt need."—B. G. ROMERO, *Central H. S., Washington, D. C.*

LONGMANS, GREEN & CO.

NEW YORK CHICAGO BOSTON

The Evolution of Arthurian Romance from the Beginnings Down to the Year 1300

By

JAMES DOUGLAS BRUCE, Ph. D.

Late Professor of the English Language and Literature in the University of Tennessee.

VOLUME I

505 pages, 8vo. Cloth, $3.25.

Part I: Traditions, Chronicles, Lays and Romances. Part II: The Holy Grail. Part III: The Prose Romances.

VOLUME II

450 pages, 8vo. Cloth, $3.25.

Part III: The Prose Romances (concluded). Part IV: Discussions. Part V: Analyses and Bibliographies.

THE JOHNS HOPKINS PRESS,
Baltimore, Maryland

THE JOHNS HOPKINS

STUDIES IN ROMANCE LITERATURES AND LANGUAGES

Edited by

D. S. Blondheim, Gilbert Chinard, and H. Carrington Lancaster

PUBLISHED

Volume I. Volney et l'Amérique, by Gilbert Chinard, 1923, 208 pages. $1.25.

Volume II. Chateaubriand et la Bible: Contribution à l'Etude des Sources des "Martyrs," by J. V. N. Smead. $1.25.

IN PRESS

La Chryseide de Mairet, a critical edition with notes and an introduction, by H. C. Lancaster.

Jefferson et les Idéologues, d'après la correspondance inédite de Destutt de Tracy, Cabanis, Jean Baptiste Say et Auguste Comte, by G. Chinard.

Chateaubriand and Virgil, by L. R. Naylor.

Chateaubriand and English literature, by M. H. Miller.

Sources of Corneille's tragedies from Médée to Pertharite, by L. M. Riddle.

The Influence of Cervantes in France. I. The first half of the Seventeenth Century, with special reference to Guérin de Bouscal, an Intermediary between Cervantes and Molière, by E. J. Crooks.

The Influence of Cervantes in France. II. A critical edition of Guérin de Bouscal's *Dom Quichot de la Manche,* and *le Gouvernement de Sanche Pansa,* by E. J. Crooks.

The "*Misterio de los Reyes Magos*"; Its Position in the Development of the Mediaeval Legend of the Three Kings, by W. Sturdevant.

THE JOHNS HOPKINS PRESS
BALTIMORE, MD.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

Digitized by Google
Original from
UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

Digitized by Google
Original from
UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

Digitized by Google
Original from
UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

NON-CIRCULATING
PERIODICAL
COLLECTION

Digitized by Google
Original from
UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

BOUND

MAR 16 1937

UNI... ...ICH.
LIBRARY

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN
3 9015 02069 6541

NON-CIRCULATING
PERIODICAL
COLLECTION

Digitized by Google

Original from
UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

Digitized by Google
Original from
UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN